Oak Street
UNCLASSIFIED

The Lausanne Treaty
and
Kemalist Turkey

Prof Lybyer
Compliments of A B M.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:56 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

The Lausanne Treaty
and
Kemalist Turkey

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 20:49 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

CONTENTS:

A Letter from Mr. Wilson on the Lausanne Treaty.

"Dead Against the Turkish Treaty"—ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

A Statement by BISHOP BRENT.

"Can Secretary Hughes Explain?"—HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS.

"A Scandalous Treaty"—JAMES W. GERARD.

"Kemalist Regime Doomed"—CALEB F. GATES.

A French Opinion on the Angora Junta.

American-Turkish War Claims.

Mr. Hughes, the Chester Concession and Mr. Child.

"A Treaty of Surrender"—A. D. F HAMLIN.

"It Dishonors America"—JOHN PRICE JACKSON.

American Missionary Interests in Turkey.

"A Purposeless and Humiliating Treaty"—FRED. PERRY POWERS.

"Christianity Extinguished in Asia Minor"—WILLIAM T. ELLIS.

"We Should Not Surrender to a Tottering Regime"— WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS.

"An Unchristian Compact"—F. G. SMITH.

"Objections to the Lausanne Treaty"—OSCAR S. STRAUS.

Origin of Capitulations.

"The Unspeakable Turk"—CHARLES W. ELIOT.

"The Turks"—CHARLES H. KIRBY.

A Memorandum.

Abolition of the Caliphate.

KEMALIST TURKEY.

New York, March 15, 1924.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 20:51 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

58
273

A Letter From Mr. Wilson on the Lausanne Treaty

13th December 1923.

My dear Mr. Gerard:

I had already seen the paper about the Lausanne Treaty which you were so kind as to send me in your letter of December eleventh, and was very glad indeed that you and those associated with you had undertaken to show the Senate the iniquity of that treaty. It is indeed iniquitous, and I sincerely hope that your protest will be effectual.

With every good wish for the Holiday season,

Faithfully yours,

Woodrow Wilson.

Hon. James W. Gerard,
One Madison Avenue,
New York.

In September, 1923, Mr. Gerard sent to Mr. Wilson copy of a pamphlet, entitled, "The Senate should reject the Turkish Treaty," and requested to comment upon it. In reply, Mr. Wilson stated that, "I must reserve my comment until I believe it will be efficacious," and expressed the hope that "this new work in which you are engaged will prosper."

On December 11, 1923, Mr. Gerard sent to Mr. Wilson copy of a Memorandum, signed by 110 citizens, against ratification by the Senate of the Lausanne Treaty, without comment. In reply, Mr. Wilson wrote to Mr. Gerard the foregoing letter, which, obviously, was not for publication, but, since he has been taken away from us, we feel that his letter may now be published with propriety, as a means of making clear to his countrymen his attitude toward a subject in which he was intensely interested, and which he considered a challenge to the moral sense of the American people.—Ed.

17 May '49 g. Albert H. Lybyer: 2 copies.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 20:52 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Dead Against the Turkish Treaty!

By Albert Bushnell Hart

Professor of Government, Harvard University.

Everybody knows that on August 6, 1923, a treaty was signed at Lausanne between the Republic of the United States of America and the so-called Republic of Turkey. The President has not yet transmitted that Treaty to the Senate; but, if and when he does, and if it receives a two-thirds vote in favor, it will become the basis of our relations with Turkey, and at the same time a law of the land binding all citizens and courts of the United States.

A recent writer in the *New Republic* is overwhelmed with grief to observe that a considerable number of notable American citizens dislike that treaty and have organized to concentrate public sentiment against it. That writer supposes that the objection must arise from those clauses of the Treaty surrendering the present extraterritorial rights of Americans; and from the failure to secure any guarantees for the safety of the Armenian subjects of Turkey. If the Treaty should not be ratified, he asserts that the remnant of the Armenians will thereby be encouraged to revolt; that the Turks will then stamp the Armenians out; and that the American opponents of the Treaty will be responsible to God and man for that catastrophe.[1]

---

[1] The author of the article in the New Republic condemns the Turks as ruthless barbarians, when he argues that they would wreak vengeance upon the innocent for the acts of others. It is preposterous to assume that a handful of Armenians in Turkey (about 200,000) would attempt any act of rebellion. Manifestly, Turkish propagandists are already 'framing up evidence' to explain and justify the atrocities which the Turks contemplate perpetrating upon the remnants of the Christians. It is pure nonsense to say that the massacres by the Turks were due to outside instigation or provocation.

American friends of Armenia do not pretend to speak for the Armenians in Turkey. These are helpless hostages; but they speak for the life of a nation. They favor an understanding, if possible,—as intimated by the author of the article—between the Armenians in Turkey and the Turks, but they cannot conceive that the Turks would accord any tolerable treatment to these Armenians merely from pity.

American friends of Armenia must think of the far greater number of exiles and refugees. They hold that the Turks must eventually come to an understanding with the Armenian race. If four million Turks are entitled to independence and to 300,000 square miles, the Armenian people, of whom there are now over 3,000,000, are likewise and equally entitled to independence and to a part of their national heritage. The Sevres Treaty allotted to Armenia 40,000 square miles. This territory is now a veritable desert. There are no more than 200,000 stragglers within its borders. The Turks do not need it (See article, headed, The Turks, page 50).—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 20:53 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Such a statement shows almost complete ignorance of the real and substantial reasons for opposing the Treaty. At the same time it evidences an obliviousness to the present state of things in the Near East.

The hard, solid mistake of the Treaty is, first, that it deals with Turkey as a responsible nation of civilized people; and, second, that it will have no influence in preventing wars in which Turkey will be a party, and which in savageness and danger to civilization will make an Armenian revolt seem only a picnic.

Opposition to the treaty is not opposition to our Government or President or Department of State; but a fair and open desire to focus the attention of the American people upon elements in the Turkish situation which seem to have been left out of account in both the negotiation and in the document.

In the first place the Treaty presumes that the Turks are assembled in a modern national state, as well organized, as permanent and as firm as the Government of Italy or of the United States. On the contrary, the evidence is irresistible that the Turks are an Asiatic group who have for six hundred years been fastened on the flank of Europe. They are almost the only Asiatics who have gained a footing in Europe that still persists. They have been a dreadful curse to Asia Minor and to Europe. They destroyed the Byzantine Empire, which was the direct continuation of the Roman Empire and the bulwark of Christian Europe. They are still essentially a barbaric people, notwithstanding the presence in their Empire for ages of Christian races such as the Armenians, the Greeks and the Syrians, who are far superior to them in culture.

The devastation of the Turks in Europe was pushed as far as the walls of Vienna; their ships long scourged the entire coast of the Mediterranean. It has taken two hundred and fifty years to push them back south of the Danube and finally to reach the western defences of the city of Constantinople. In the world war they were the puppets of Germany, were finally defeated and most of them driven out of Europe. In the course of the war they completed the most dreadful murder of any people on record. They slew in the foulest and most depraved manner several millions of Armenians and Greeks, whose only crime was that they wanted to get out from under the frightful misgovernment of the Turkish Empire.

The Turks are far more alien to Europe than the Chinese or Japanese. They profess a religion which has, for

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 20:54 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

twelve hundred years, been the greatest enemy of Christianity. They have very little literature; few of them are business men; they have almost no physicians or publicists, or scientists. They have always excelled in war because of the ability of an absolute government to make an army to suit it, to strike rapid blows and to plunder the conquered countries. Their tax system is extortion. They have no body of laws in the western sense.[1]

Such a thing as popular government has never been known among them. There is not the slightest evidence that there has ever been anything that we would call an election for members of the so-called Assembly or Parliament of Angora. There is no evidence that that assembly exercises power to appoint the heads of the state.[2] They have no courts acquainted with the public law of the western world or competent to decide questions involving modern business and commerce. The mere fact that they defeated a Greek army and seized upon Smyrna (which was destroyed amidst massacres whilst in their power) surely does not establish them as a civilized nation. The Treaty throughout its text assumes that the Turks are a modern nation with a sense of responsibility and the means of securing justice to the native and foreign population. We promise to the Turks what we have the machinery and the will to enforce. They promise to us protection and justice which they are both unable and unwilling to afford to their own population, and still less to foreigners.

---

[1] Under Turkish laws, the testimony of a Christian is inadmissible against that of a Moslem. But the chief trouble with Turkish laws is that they are made and enforced in the interest of officials. There is one law for the rich and one for the poor—always the highest bidder receives the award. A typical instance can be cited: A defendant in a case offered a silk rug to the Judge, who advised him that he could not announce his decision, as he had not yet heard from the plaintiff, who might offer a higher bid. Such corruption is treated as the most natural thing in the world, no shame is felt and no blame attached.—Ed.

[2] "The elections to the new Turkish Parliament," says a dispatch to the Boston Transcript, under date of August 19, 1923, "were a farce." No opposition party, indeed, "not one opponent," sums up Tevhid, a Constantinople daily, its comment upon the composition of the Parliament. "Only 11 out of 1,300 voters participated in the elections in Trebizond," says Istikbal, a newspaper of that city, and adds, "according to our information, elections in other districts have been conducted along similar lines." Ikdam, a Turkish daily of Constantinople, remarks: "The same old people, with new titles, will govern in the same old way." Kemal is head of the "Popular Party." This party nominated and elected all of the 280 members of the Assembly. Under the constitution of the "republic," this packed body 'elects' a President, who appoints the Premier, and who designates all the members of an Upper House, which has the veto power over all the acts of the Assembly.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 20:54 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

In the second place, we at present have a Treaty which has served very well for ninety-four years because it recognizes things as they are. The Turks have always been glad to permit Europeans and Americans to settle their own difficulties and lawsuits, because the Turkish system of government was so hopelessly inadequate for such things. Of course it is not the kind of treaty that we make with civilized nations. Yet under that system American schools, colleges and hospitals, American business houses and shipping, have prospered in Turkey; although our Turkish trade has always been very small in proportion to the population of the Empire.

Other nations which also had this convenient extraterritoriality made it their diplomatic business to buy or force concessions from the Turks for railroads, mines, irrigation works, harbors and oil wells. In the period before the world war, Europe was sucking up those commercial privileges, a process in which the United States did not share; but we are told now that we must have "concessions."

There seems no doubt that one of the main objects of the treaty is to facilitate the so-called Chester concession and others that are expected to follow. The Chester concession proves to have included railroads already conceded to French capitalists and partly built, and oil deposits in Armenia and in Mosul. So far as the public is informed, it has passed into the hands of Canadian capitalists, who have not been able to raise the money to make the necessary payments. The Turkish Government is reported to have cancelled the concession.[1] Truly that is not a cause for which the American people are called upon to make a new treaty. As a matter of fact the concessions are a source of terrible evil to Turkey, because the money paid is not likely to find its way into the public treasury; and the country is deprived of the future opportunity of developing itself on its own soil with its own capital.

A third fundamental objection to the treaty is that it comes as a sequence of and in the wake of treaties made by Great Britain and France, which are disgraceful to those two countries and the farthest possible from our American ideas of fair play. Besides their acknowledged ability to make savage wars which respect neither age nor sex, the Turks have shown themselves for several hundred years the most successful dip-

[1] In 1913, American exports to Turkey amounted to $3,313,821, or 16 cents per capita for the Empire. For the so-called Chester Concession, see footnotes on pages 54 and 25.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 20:55 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

lomats in Europe, by playing off one nation against another. That is how they managed to get England and France on their side in the Crimean War. That is how they induced England to come to their rescue when the Russians all but put them out of business in 1878, and the English received the Island of Cyprus, (principally inhabited by Greeks) as the price of their support.

We seem to think of the Turks as conquerors in the later stages of the World War. As a matter of fact they lost Egypt to the Egyptians, Arabia to the Arabians, Palestine and Mesopotamia to the English and Syria to the French. The present Turkey has less than one-half of the area and about one-fourth of the population of the Turkish Empire of 1914. The Turks had even signed the Treaty of Sevres, practically giving up their last hold on Europe. Where did they get the military material necessary for the campaign against the Greeks in Asia Minor? Perhaps some of it from the Russians, perhaps more of it from the French. We must always remember that the Turks are not an inventive or industrial people, and presumably are incapable of producing their own material of war.

At any rate there could be no doubt that Turkey threatened the French with an invasion of Syria and the British with an invasion of Mesopotamia; whereupon both France and England, each afraid that the other would get the Turkish favor, while it got left, kotowed to His Majesty Kemal Pasha.[1] They did what Austria did and Russia did and France did, at one time or another; they made friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. The United States by signing a treaty on similar lines, following the English and French treaties, involves itself in that tortuous course of a diplomacy of threats and backstairs influence and concessions, and inducements and rivalries and secret understandings which has characterized the dealings of western Europe in its dealings with Turkey for centuries. From 1854 to 1890 the British Embassy was the seat of power of international decisions in Turkey. Then it was supplanted by Germany, who built a bigger Embassy and was practically carrying on the country when the World War broke out. The United States has no share in such questions as protecting the Suez Canal and the land route to India and the commerce to the Black Sea and settling the rivalries in

[1] According to information from Constantinople, Kemal, as a means of overcoming the rising tide of discontent against his regime, may undertake a military adventure in Syria, or Mesopotamia or in the Transcaucasus, which might achieve an initial success.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:19 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

the Balkan peninsula. The proposed treaty puts us on a parity with nations whose Turkish diplomacy has long been an affront to the real interests of Europe, and are sacrificing civilization today.

Fourth, the Treaty will not permanently help the missionaries who have made an appeal for ratification. Naturally the missionaries want another chance, for they have been in Turkey for a hundred years without converting any Turks to Christianity.[1] That statement is not quite exact. They have converted (to Protestant Christianity) many Armenians and Greeks who were already Christians; and they have had a large share in awakening among the Turkish population some notion of what western civilization is. Yet it is undeniable that in about ninety years of missionary enterprise they have never brought over from Islam ninety Turks of high character and station and influence, the kind of converts who changed Rome to Christianity ages ago. The treaty provides for liberty of conscience and worship—for the foreigners. In fact they will apparently have far greater protection from tyranny and extortion than the native Turk. But the summary of the Treaty which has been made public contains no clause guaranteeing to foreigners the right to hold religious services for Turkish nationals; nor is there any protection for converts if they accept a new religious faith. The very important Articles 3 to 8 are to have force only for seven years and the Articles 9 to 28 only for five years.[2]

---

[1] See article, American Missionary Institutions in Turkey, page 36.

[2] Secretary Hughes, in his New York speech (January 23, 1924) said that the American-Turkish Treaty was based substantially upon the Allied-Turkish Treaty, although our Treaty does not contain the political and territorial clauses which concern the Allies only. An examination of the Allied-Turkish Treaty, of which the full text is available, does not disclose any provision such as referred to by Prof. Hart.

But it is useless to argue along this line. The vital fact is that the Lausanne Treaty accepts the abrogation of the capitulations. The merit or demerit of the Treaty must be determined upon this fact only. The treaty, in effect, abandons the protection of American nationals, and, without safeguards or proof of ability or good faith, turns them over to the tender mercies of a government which has never given the slightest evidence of its power or intention to establish or administer justice. In other words, it renounces and surrenders the sacred right of America to protect her own nationals, and accepts the worthless promises of Turkey. Mr. Straus and Mr. Morgenthau have said that

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:20 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

The real influence of the missionaries over the Turks has been through their generally enlightening influence on the whole community. They were so imprudent as to inspire the Greeks and Armenians with American ideas of personal liberty which to the Turkish mind was a reason for extirpating them. It is not to be presumed that similar ideas can be sown in the minds of the Turks with impunity. The whole Turkish regime was one of force and fear; yet a slicker people never lived. The educated Turk is delightful in social relations. He loves dogs and children and wives and flowers and nature; but at heart he is still a Mongol Tartar when it comes to objectors to his rule or enemies of his territory.[1]

In a certain sense this discussion is unnecessary because, treaty or no treaty, it is not conceivable that the few million Turks can build up a state that is competent to stand alongside Europe either in peace or war. The shell is likely to break in at any time. If that occurs, how fortunate for the United States, if we are the only great power to foresee the debacle and to refuse to make a treaty with such a fierce, sanguinary and destructive people. Mr. Peffer, in the *New Republic,* justifies the Turks for exterminating the Armenians because, he says, "What would happen to the Negroes if they rose in armed rebellion against the United States and in league with our enemies?"

A brief answer may be made that goes to the heart of the matter. Suppose the Negroes of the United States had seized upon the white race by main force and reduced it to bondage, and then had wiped it out by fire and sword. Would we expect any respectable nation to recognize those bandits, make treaties with them and accept concessions from them and treat them as though they were our brethren?

The Turk has no place in Europe nor in the circle of civilized nations.

Turkish nationals are subject to the caprice of their rulers and that Turkish courts are uniformly corrupt. History tells us that any undertaking which depends for its performance upon the good faith of the Turks is insecure and hazardous. The maintenance of the capitulatory system for centuries was in recognition of this fact and of the fundamental incompatability of Moslem laws and institutions with those of the civilized nations.—Ed.

[1] See article headed "The Turks," page 50.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:21 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Bishop Brent Says:

"I was in Geneva while the Lausanne Treaty was being framed and of course heard firsthand reports of what was done. I am against America's giving any recognition to Turkey under the terms of the Treaty."

Can Secretary Hughes Explain?

By Herbert Adams Gibbons

Prof. of History and Political Economy at Robert College, 1909-12; Author, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, etc.

On the eve of the Lausanne Conference, Secretary Hughes laid down seven definite conditions for the acceptance by the United States of a new treaty with Turkey. The Treaty, signed at Lausanne on August 6, 1923, fulfills none of these conditions.

Therefore, before asking for the ratification of the Treaty, the Department of State owes it to the American people to explain why conditions that were considered a sine quo non in October, 1922, were no longer deemed essential in August, 1923.

"The American Government," the President said in his message to Congress, "is not proposing to barter away its principles."

Republicans and Democrats alike are opposed to expediency as the guiding principle in the foreign policy of this nation. Therefore, if they admit the justice of Secretary Hughes' plea that we should not renew relations with Russia for expediency's sake, how can they be asked to approve of the Treaty of Lausanne on the single and SOLE ground of expediency?

If we have more reason to bank on the stability of the Kemalist Government and the good faith of the Angora junta than we have to bank upon the stability of the Russian Government and the good faith of the Soviets, Secretary Hughes ought to show us such a reason before we recognize the new status quo in the Near East and before we enter into normal diplomatic relations with the dictatorship of Mustapha Kemal and his military clique.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:22 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

A Scandalous Treaty

By James W. Gerard

Ex-Ambassador to Germany.

On January 23, 1924, Secretary Hughes delivered a speech before the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, in the course of which he discussed at length American-Turkish relations and the Lausanne Treaty. The following is the text of Mr. Gerard's answer, made the following evening, at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, to protest against the Lausanne Treaty, at the Metropolitan Life Auditorium, New York.

Secretary Hughes states that this Government has assumed no political obligation toward Armenia, that America acquiesced in the abrogation of the capitulations and abandoned her vested rights and interests in Turkey because the Allies had done so. He also states that, at no stage in the negotiations at Lausanne, was the American position determined by the so-called Chester concession. He calls in two Americans as witnesses in support of his position, and, in conclusion, rests his case upon the humiliating ground that, by surrendering to the Turks, we have earned their good-will,—the good-will of those whom Judge Hughes, in a speech at the Hotel Plaza, on February 8, 1919, characterized as murderers.[1]

Secretary Hughes may have the good-will of the Turks, but I will show that America did take political steps and did assume obligations concerning Armenia; that the Chester concession played a determining role in our adherence to the Lausanne Treaty, and further, that not only does America not receive equal advantages with the Allies, as Secretary Hughes asserts, but that the Allies were forced to yield to the Turks on the proposition of capitulations and upon the Armenian case, as a result of a bargain which the American representatives entered into with the Turks, whereby America supported them in these two subjects.

Armenia did not ask this Government for any help in the settlement of her case. The Allies had already made specific pledges to Armenia. But, in December, 1918, Senator Lodge offered a resolution in the Senate, expressing the hope that

[1] Secretary Hughes has requested not a few of the opponents of the Treaty to reverse their position upon it, and has solicited expressions of opinion from others in favor of its ratification.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:23 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

the Peace Conference, of which America was a member, might take the necessary steps for the setting up of an independent Armenian state. In February, 1919, the Allies took up the consideration of the Turkish problem, but, the United States Government asked them to defer action because America hoped to take part in the settlement of that problem. On June 23, 1920, Lloyd George stated in the House of Commons that postponement of the Turkish problem had been due to the *request* made to the Allies by America, and on October 13, 1922, Austin Chamberlain stated that the Allies were encouraged by President Wilson to believe that America would take part in the Turkish settlement, and had therefore postponed action.

In April, 1920, the President of the United States accepted the invitation of the Allied Powers to define and did define the boundaries of Armenia. Here are two affirmative political acts.

Who, then, led President Wilson to believe that America would take part in the Turkish settlement?

In February, 1919, a cablegram, signed by Hughes, Lodge and other representative Americans, urged the President to do all that was necessary to secure the independence of Armenia. On June 22, 1919, Hughes, Root, Lodge and other Republican and Democratic leaders, urged the President to send to Armenia requisite food, munitions and supplies for 50,000 men. In August, 1919, Hughes, Root, Lodge and others urged the President to send troops to Armenia. In December, 1919, Hughes, Root, Lodge and others, urged the President to "abandon the mandate proposal and, instead, extend to Armenia necessary aid by direct agreement, under a definite and continuing policy."

During the Summer of 1919, Great Britain announced her intention of withdrawing her troops from the Trans-Caucasus and Armenia. (She had about 500 men in Armenia.) At that time, the Armenians lacked any adequate means of self-defense. Therefore, in August, 1919, several members of our Committee, including Messrs. Hughes, Root, Lodge, Eliot, and others, authorized me to ask the President to send American troops to Armenia to replace the British, and to furnish equipment for an Armenian army. Then, on September 5, 1919, the Secretary of State informed me that, 'with the cordial approval of this Government, France has agreed to send immediately ten to twelve thousand troops into the Caucasus to replace the British troops.'[1]

[1] M. Auguste Bénard (Officier d'Académie), in a recent issue of "Aiguillon," devotes an article to this phase of the subject. He says in part:

"* * * France agreed (in 1919) to dispatch 12,000 troops to the Armenian Republic, and directed Col. Bromond to organize an Armenian army in Cilicia

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:23 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

On September 8, 1919, Senator Williams offered a Resolution in the Senate, authorizing the President to send troops to Armenia, and to furnish equipment for an Armenian army, etc. This Resolution was consolidated with the Lodge Resolution, and hearings were held by a sub-Committee under the Chairmanship of Senator Harding.

In view of this action of the Senate, France held back the despatch of troops to Armenia, and Great Britain refrained, for a similar reason, from furnishing arms and munitions.

With the conclusion of the hearings on October 10, 1919, Senator Harding, as Chairman of the sub-Committee of the Senate, informed me that, realizing as he did the desperate character of the situation in Armenia, he would report at once, and, further, specified the recommendations which he was disposed to make. Then months elapsed and no action was taken.

Consequently, by numerous letters and telegrams, we conveyed to him information showing that the conditions in Armenia were growing worse from day to day; that the Turks were deriving comfort and encouragement from our delay; that the Armenians were defenseless, and could not get help elsewhere pending the disposition of the sub-Committee's Resolution, and that we would be responsible for the consequences of our dilatory policy.

He acknowledged the justice and force of these arguments, but, owing to the Presidential primaries in which he was engaged, he did not make his report for seven months, or until May 13, 1920, and his report did not contain the recommendations which he said he would make.

On December 17, 1920, President-elect **Harding,** recognizing America's obligation to Armenia, agreed to the sending of an identic note to the Powers calling upon them to carry into effect the provisions of the Sevres Treaty relating to Armenia, when the President would ask Congress for "such financial material aid to the new republic, etc." In May, 1921, President **Harding** again stated that he was "still in favor of the independence of Armenia and of the American people and Government doing their share in the upbuilding of Armenia," etc. On November 10, 1922, President **Harding** promised that *"Everything that may be done will be done in seeking to pro-*

(Lesser Armenia). Had it not been for the subsequent intrigues of some of the Great Powers, these measures would have consolidated and rendered secure the position of the Armenian Republic. But, the United States Government, which had given its assent to our sending troops to Armenia, informed us a few days later, that it, itself, had decided to send troops to Armenia; and British intrigues with Kemal forced us to abandon Cilicia. Responsibility for Armenia's plight rests upon America and England. Col. Bromond's forthcoming book will fully support the truth of these statements. We will, in due time, return to this subject, and, without regard to protests and denials, make a complete exposé of the circumstances which resulted in the abandonment of our faithful ally—Armenia."

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:23 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

tect the Armenian people and preserve to them the rights which the Sevres Treaty undertook to bestow."

Secretary Hughes repudiates these commitments, because, as he has stated, in substance, in one of his letters, commitments which have been made and steps which have been taken by the President and Congress are merely expressions of private sentiment. WHY? Because the Department of State has not endorsed them.[1]

At Lausanne, according to reliable information which has come to us, American representatives made common cause with the Turks in forcing the Allies to yield to the Turkish view upon the proposition of the capitulations and in the Armenian case. And, in consideration of this role which our represen-

---

[1]President Wilson, in requesting the Allies to defer action on the Turkish Treaty and in defining the boundaries of Armenia, and President Harding in making specific promises in favor of Armenia, certainly acted within their constitutional authority. Manifestly, this Government is responsible for the consequences of the utterances and acts of its President, when so acting. It is evident that if such declarations and commitments can be evaded by the legal quibbles which Secretary Hughes uses, then all accepted standards of honor among men must cease to have a meaning. The untutored layman expects officials and those who seek office to make commitments and promises, and expects that they will carry them into effect to the extent of their ability and opportunity. The plea of avoidance which Secretary Hughes invokes would make the Constitution a cave of adullam for dishonest and irresponsible politicians.

The vital question is neither one of law nor even one of morals. It is one of fact. That fact is that the United States injected itself, of its own free will, into the Near Eastern situation; it led the whole world to believe that it would help Armenia; it deprived Armenia of the opportunity to look for help elsewhere, **and it delayed for one and one-half years the settlement of the Turkish problem.** This **delay** led to the division and cross purposes among the Allies, and made it possible for the Turks to organize resistance. The slaughter, at the hands of the Turks, of over one million Greeks and Armenians, since the conclusion of the armistice; the destruction of the independence of Armenia, and the restoration of the Turks to power are the direct results of that policy of delay which America imposed upon the Allied Powers. Secretary Hughes cannot shift the terrible responsibility which this Government has in this melancholy affair by any legal quibbles, nor can he cause the world to forget the utter inconsistency and insincerity of his policy as Secretary of State when contrasted with his utterances and activities before assuming office.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:23 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

tatives played, the Turks lent them support in securing from the Allies recognition for the open-door policy. True, the Chester concession was granted before the Lausanne Conference, but its validity was contested by Great Britain, France and Armenia, and it was under the formula of the open-door that Armenia forced the Allies to abandon certain contracts which their nationals had entered into with the Turkish Government, and thereby validated the Chester concession, which, however, has since vanished into thin air. There were two other reasons for the interest which the Government took in this matter. It was evident that the Chester group could not start operations in Turkey without the moral and diplomatic support of our Government. The chief motive of the Turks, of course, in granting this concession was to secure a large loan in America, which they could not hope for without resumption of diplomatic relations. Also, by granting these concessions the Turks hoped, as was commonly known, to secure American diplomatic support at Lausanne. They relied on the Chester group to prevail upon America to accede to their views in certain matters as payment for these concessions. In consequence, the Department of State reverted to the old and discredited policy of Dollar Diplomacy,—a policy which we believed had long been discarded, in response to the overwhelming revolt of American sentiment. The so-called Chester concession has already been sold to a foreign group for $300,000. **I am therefore justified in stating that our Government not only played an unworthy role in this matter, but also exhibited poor judgment.**

But it is untrue that we have secured, under the Lausanne Treaty, equal advantages with the Allies. Great Britain has been designated mandatary for Mesopotamia, and is in complete control of the resources of that country. She also has secured clear title for the Island of Cyprus, sovereign rights over the Soudan and certain rights over Egypt. Likewise, France secured Syria and holds complete control over the resources of that country. But why contend that because the Allies have made peace with the Turks it becomes necessary for America to follow them? They were at war with Turkey. We were not. There was not a single American interest in Turkey that would have suffered by maintaining the status quo.

Secretary Hughes quotes from a letter written to him by Dr. Barton. That letter has been written to Secretary Hughes at the instance of Secretary Hughes, acting through one of

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:24 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

his assistants who took a special trip over to Boston for that purpose. Dr. Barton only three months ago condemned the Lausanne Treaty, and expressed the belief that "the Senate will not ratify it." Dr. Gates, on the other hand, in a letter which I have in my possession, states that the Kemalist experiment is doomed to failure.[1]

And furthermore, what protection does this Treaty offer to American rights and interests? It offers the protection of Turkish laws and Turkish courts. The Department of State must have reports from Constantinople that the Kemalist laws and Kemalist courts are now operating in like manner to those of Hamid and of Talaat. Foreign business houses in Constantinople now decline to accept any registered mail, because Turkish officials deliver them after having relieved them of their valuable contents.[2]

We are opposed to the ratification of the Lausanne Treaty also because the Kemalist Government is in a precarious condition. The Young Turks, who dominate the situation in Constantinople, are contending against the Kemalists. Out of 5,000,000 estimated population of Turkey 85% are threatened with starvation. The whole countryside is overrun by bands of robbers led by retired army officers. Also, the revenues of the Government represent not more than one-tenth of its expenditures.

We hold that, since our nationals in Turkey must submit to Turkish law in any event, rejection or ratification of the Treaty by the Senate can neither improve nor damage their position.

---

[1] The statements of Dr. Gates and of Dr. Barton, and of a few Americans, now resident in Turkey, in favor of the Lausanne Treaty, can only be accepted and understood as the statements of hapless hostages in the hands of outlaws and savages. It would be as unthinkable for these Americans to testify otherwise as it would for the few remaining Christians. The Acting Greek Patriarch, following the entry of the Kamalists into Constantinople, issued a proclamation, in which he put all the blame for the misfortunes of the Greeks upon their own "misdeeds"; asked the Turks to forgive and forget the wrongs which the Greeks had committed upon them, and expressed gratitude for the uniform benevolence and tolerance of Turkish rule. Does anyone in his senses consider this a free and untrammeled expression of opinion? To such cringeing abasement does the present policy of the "civilized world" lead.—Ed.

[2] The United States has been unfortunate in its post-war representation at Constantinople. Admiral Bristol, its High Commissioner, has been a defender of Turkish practices and of the Turkish cause. He has excused massacres by the Turks, and has expressed the opinion that Mohammedanism was a better form of religion than Christianity. Long before the Grecian debacle, he made an extended report to the Department of State—over 30 pages long—a report which Kemal might have gladly signed. The American Embassy, in his charge, has been a center for Turkish propaganda.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:24 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

We hold that rejection would give the United States a chance to demand of Turkey evidence of real reform in its governmental methods and judicial procedure as a condition precedent to resuming treaty relations. We believe that ratification of this Treaty may very probably force America into war with Turkey. It is the avowed hope of the Turks to secure a loan in America following the ratification of the Treaty. Should they fail in that hope, they would throw all caution to the winds, which would very probably precipitate an armed conflict between us.

We need not fight the Turks, any more than do we fight the Soviets, to impose our views upon them. We can well afford to wait until they meet our views.

We still stand for an independent Armenia. Our Government, like the Allied Governments, has recognized the independence and unity of Armenia. We advocate that our Government make the recognition of the independence and unity of Armenia a condition precedent to a resumption of relations with Turkey and Russia. (The British Labor Government continues to recognize the de jure independence of Armenia.) In the light of the expressed views of Russian leaders of all shades of opinion, we are justified in believing that Russia will interpose no objection to the setting up of an independent Armenia. We would welcome an accord between Armenia and Russia similar to that which exists between Egypt and England. We believe that exertion by America, in due time, of her moral influence, can effect the reestablishment of the independence of Armenia, and we feel and insist that America is in honor bound to do that toward the redemption of her obligation to Christian Armenia.[1]

---

[1]Armenia lost her independence in 1375, and was subsequently divided among Turkey (since 1451; area, 101,000 Sq. M.); Russia (since 1828, 1878; area, 26,491 Sq. M.), and Persia (since 1472, area, 5,789 Sq. M.). In 1914, the Armenian race in the world numbered 4,476,000, of which 2,126,000 lived in Turkish Armenia (1,403,000) and in other parts of Turkey; 2,054,000 in Russian Armenia (1,296,000) and in other parts of Russia, and the rest, in other parts of the world. The Armenians now number a little over 3,000,000, of whom about 800,000 are refugees from Turkey; a little over 2,000,000, including nearly 300,000 refugees, in Russian Armenia and in other parts of Russia, and possibly 200,000 in Turkey.

During the World War, 200,000 Armenians fought as independent units or in the Allied ranks. In October, 1917, Russia quit the war.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:25 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

The Armenians took over the Caucasus front, and fought the Turks for five months. On May 28, 1918, Russian Armenia declared her independence, and assumed the title of "Armenian Republic." In 1918, she was recognized by Soviet Russia and Turkey, and, in 1920, by the United States and the other nations of the world. In May, 1920, she put down uprisings, in a few localities, instigated and engineered by Soviet Russia. In June, 1920, Kemal, supported by Kurds and Tartars of Soviet Azarbaidjan, attacked her, and was repulsed. On August 10, 1920, her delegate signed the Sevres Treaty, which allotted to her parts of four Provinces of Turkish Armenia, boundaries of which were defined, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty, by the President of the United States in November, 1920, (about 40,000 sq. miles). This part of Armenia, however, has never been occupied by the Armenians. Its estimated pre-war population of 1,500,000 has since been reduced to less than 200,000, of which possibly 60,000 is Turk. On September 22, 1920, a Turkish army, equipped with arms and munitions, supplied by Moscow, France and Italy (Italian ships ferried Turkish units to the Armenian front), attacked Armenia from the South, and a Bolshevist force threatened her from the Northeast. On October 14, 1920, Soviet Russia, by an ultimatum, demanded that (1) Armenia offer free passage to Russian troops to join the Kemalists; (2) sever relations with the Allies, and (3) denounce the Sevres Treaty. Armenia rejected the Russian ultimatum in toto. In November, six weeks after the outbreak of hostilities, Armenia, under the increasing pressure of the Turks, threatened by Soviet Russia, betrayed by some of her former Allies and deserted by the whole world, "accepted" the Turkish terms of peace, resulting in the reduction of her area from 26,491 sq. miles to about 15,000 sq. miles, and of her population from 2,159,000 to about 1,500,000. On December 2, 1920, Bolshevist agents took over the Armenian Government. This Armenia is now known as the Soviet Republic of Armenia, and is one of the six "independent" members of the new Russian Confederation, formed under the Constitution of the Soviet Republics, adopted on July 6, 1923. Armenia, having joined the Soviet Republics of her own "free will," has the right under Article II of the Constitution of the Confederation to withdraw from the Confederation at "her option"—if she can. According to *Zariavostoko,* official organ of the Communist Party in the Trans-Caucasus, there are 1,692 communists in Armenia,—1,624 males and 68 females. (For further information concerning Armenia, see footnote, p. 33.) —Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:25 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Kemalist Regime Doomed

The following excerpts are taken from a letter from Dr. Gates, President of Robert College, Constantinople, written before the Lausanne Conference, when American nationals in Turkey, or those who have relations with Turkey, could still express themselves without intimidation or restraint.

" * * When the necessity of combatting Europe is removed, the Turks will find that there are dissensions within their own body and divergent tendencies which would tend toward breaking up their nation. There is a moderate party and an extremist party. The military are now in control. * * **

*"The Kemalists have been making economic mistakes. They have laid very heavy duties upon articles of import that can be manufactured in the country with a view to encouraging home industries. They do not realize that it takes generations to produce an artisan and a commercial class. * * * It will not be long, also, before the Turks will realize very keenly their need of the Christian population which has been driven out. The Christians were the producers and the Turks were the consumers, except for the Turkish peasantry, engaged in agriculture, and they are rather shiftless farmers.*

"Now, it is a very serious question how long the new Turkish state can hold out and keep together under these conditions. They are trying an experiment unique in history, so far as I know, of combining both the legislative and executive functions in one body. The ministers are responsible to this assembly and are elected by it. I believe that the result will be that a small clique will get possession of the government and run it badly, somewhat after the manner of the Union and Progress party which dominated the country during the war."

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:26 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

A French Opinion of the Angora Junta

L'Echo National, which is edited by Georges Clemenceau and Andre Tardieu, published in a recent issue the following letter from a French resident of Constantinople:

> "The Lausanne Treaty confirmed the abandonment of our rights, and, its consequences, which now afflict us, are so indescribably sad that even the most stout and tolerant hearts despair and rebel.
>
> "I do not concern myself with politics, but I say sincerely that, when I think of the occurrences in the Near East during the last two years, I am filled with a sense of horror and shame.
>
> "In order to disband two battalions of troops which we had in Cilicia, we left the Armenians, who had fought for us, to their fate.[1]
>
> "We betrayed our own allies by entering into a separate compact with the Turks.
>
> "We furnished the rebels of Angora with arms, and we turned over the arms and munitions which we had seized at the Dardanelles, at the conclusion of the Armistice, to a go-between, who delivered them to the Turks.
>
> "We encouraged the expulsion of Greeks and Armenians from Turkey and made it possible for the Turks to slaughter innocent Armenians and Greeks, and to rob them of their possessions—personal and real.
>
> "Our officers received instructions to say that the evacuation of Cilicia was carried out in good order, whereas the Turks fired upon the fleeing mass of refugees.
>
> "When the Turks set fire to Smyrna, the French High Commissioner of Syria, who was on board the S. S. 'Pierre Loti,' anchored at the Port of Smyrna, was instructed to refrain from inquiring into the barbarities which were being perpetrated by

---

[1] In October, 1916, France in consideration of the Armenians furnishing fighting troops for France in Palestine, promised autonomy to Cilicia, otherwise known as Lesser Armenia. Armenian troops occupied Cilicia in 1918. M. Raymond Poincare, President of France, by a letter dated February 16, 1919, said: ". . . As France never doubted Armenia, so Armenia never doubted France; and, after having borne together common tribulations and sufferings for the triumph of Right and Justice, the two friendly countries may now commune with each other with a common joy and common pride. The Republic knows full well that Armenia, and particularly noble Cilicia, expect it to help them so that it may be possible for them to enjoy in security the benefits of peace and liberty."

But in October, 1921, France entered into an agreement with the Turks whereby she reserved to herself certain economic advantages in Cilicia—since repudiated by the Turks,—and bound herself to withdraw, and did withdraw, from it.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:26 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

the Kemalists, lest he offend them,—those Kemalists who are now exacting an 'income tax' from French Nationals; even before the ratification of the Lausanne Treaty and in utter disregard of their own 'laws.'

"The scandalous cowardice of Lausanne has already borne rich fruit.

"It is now impossible, we are convinced, to maintain against these emboldened barbarians any of the safeguards which the capitulations alone made possible,—against an autocratic government which is utterly dishonest, corrupt, and inhuman."

American-Turkish War Claims

According to a telegram from Washington, dated December 26, 1923, Admiral Bristol notified the State Department that he signed an agreement with the Turkish Government on December 24th, under which a committee of Turkish and American delegates, two of each, will be appointed, within six months after the treaty ratifications have been exchanged, to consider the claims of their respective nationals.

The proposed committee comprises two Turks and two Americans, so that it threatens to be a mere debating society, without the powers to reach a conclusion. The Turks will doubtless make exorbitant claims against America on the ground that 30,000 or more American citizens of Armenian and Greek extraction, whose American citizenship Turkey does not recognize, by fighting in the American army, or by fighting the Turks in the Caucasus and in Palestine, inflicted damages whose total may easily be contrived to leave the balance in favor of Turkey.

Furthermore, Turkey has never remitted any part of her foreign or domestic indebtedness—because her revenues have always fallen below her expenditures. As a result of the elimination of the Christians, who were the producers, her economic position is now infinitely worse than it has ever been, and she must secure even for the maintenance of the government repeated foreign loans. She cannot possibly become a self-supporting state. It is evident that even though she should recognize her obligations to American nationals, she cannot meet them. She may perhaps attempt it, knowing it to be impossible.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:26 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Mr. Hughes, the Chester Concession and Mr. Child

* * *

Secretary **Hughes** (in his New York speech, on January 23, 1924):

"* * * *At no stage in the negotiations was the American position determined by the so-called Chester concession. This had been granted before negotiations of our treaty with Turkey had begun. This Government took no part in securing it; this Government made no barter of any of its rights for this or any other concession.*"[1]

The N. Y. Evening Post (December 19, 1923):

> "* * * George W. Goethals, who had, as a matter of fact, entered the affairs of the Company (Chester) at the request of Government officials * * * thought that things were going too far and resigned * * *."

---

[1] This Government had only two rights in and with regard to Turkey, namely, the capitulations and its right and duty to speak for Armenia. It surrendered these rights in toto. The Chester Concession was contested by England, France and Armenia. See Mr. Gerard's article, page 17, and footnote, page 54.

The Turks granted the Chester Concession to secure American diplomatic support at Lausanne and a large loan in America. **It was a matter of common repute that the United States Government participated in the Lausanne Conference for the purpose of securing confirmation of the Chester Concession.**

In what were the Turks chiefly interested at Lausanne? In the capitulations and in the Armenian case.

What was the principal subject of interest for this Government? The Chester Concession.

The Turks supported America in the Chester matter, and America, according to Turkish testimony, assumed a *benevolent attitude* toward them in the capitulations and in the Armenian case.

An American Churchman, who was at Lausanne during the Conference, says that the Conference was once broken up, and that the American Observer prevailed upon the Allies to yield to the Turks.

Also, a former American Ambassador to Turkey has publicly stated that this Government made concessions to the Turks, as a means of clinching the Chester Concession.

Furthermore, the Turkish newspapers of Constantinople expressed gratitude to America for the "benevolent attitude" of her representa-

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:27 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

The *N. Y. Evening Post* of June 9, 1923, carried an interview with Frederick S. Blacknall, General Manager of the Chester Company, in which he was quoted as follows:

> "* * * *Late in 1922 the holdings of the foreign interests were turned over to a voting trust, and,* ***at the request of the Department of State in Washington,*** *in order to insure that the Company would remain in American hands, Gen. Goethals, Admiral H. H. Rousseau, and H. C. Sheridan, who was the American representative of Vickers, Ltd., were named as voting trustees."*

---

tives at Lausanne. One Turkish newspaper informed its readers that the Turkish Delegation was assured by a "highly placed personage" that America might speak for Armenia, but in a perfunctory way only. Contrary to the assurance of President Harding that "* * * *everything will be done to preserve to the Armenian people the rights which the Sevres Treaty undertook to bestow,"* the American Observer suggested the assigning of a "refuge" to the Armenians, and then cynically displayed an official notice to the effect that his suggestion was "unofficial" only.

Manifestly, the confirmation of the Chester Concession which was the chief and apparently sole object of American diplomacy at Lausanne, rendered essential the abandonment of Armenia. The most vital part of that concession—the oil deposits—was situated in the region which was liberated and allotted to Armenia by President Wilson, acting under the provisions of the Sevres Treaty. Furthermore, the greater proximity to the sea of the Armenian oil rendered necessary the control of both the Armenian and Mosul fields by a common ownership. *Consequently, the Department of State repudiated the award of the President of the United States to Armenia, in order to serve a group of speculators, not without connection with that group which has debased and corrupted the Administration of the best minds now in office.*

The notorious activities of the American Observer at Lausanne, on behalf of the oil interests, supported by the Department of State, elicited from the *London Times* the comment that America was playing an unworthy role, and led the *New York World* to fasten upon Mr. Hughes the significant appellation of "Secretary of Oil."

Mr. Hughes *employed all the prestige and honor of America in behalf of the same interests which have seemingly controlled the foreign policy of the United States under this Administration.. He demanded opportunity for them in the oil fields of Mosul, on the ground that America "had contributed to the common victory," but he would not attempt to redeem President Harding's pledge to Armenia, on the ground that America "had not declared war on Turkey." An example of his policy of every prerogative but no responsibility.—Ed.*

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:27 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

A Washington dispatch to the *N. Y. Evening Post* (July 18, 1923):

> "Agreement of the negotiators at Lausanne to leave the question of the Mesopotamian oil rights to be thrashed out later is wholly satisfactory from the American official point of view.
>
> "The American Delegation at Lausanne has maintained * * * that there should be no action at Lausanne which would interfere with any previously established vested rights. *The American position relative to the Chester concession stands upon this basis.*
>
> "The American view ever since the conclusion of the war has been that the United States must not be deprived of advantages which the Allied Powers claimed merely because it was not at war with Turkey. Since the defeat of Turkey was directly due to the defeat of Germany on the Western front, it has been maintained that the Washington Government must be recognized as an equal participant * * * etc. (in oil?)"

The New York World (April 13, 1923):

> "The Chester Concession issues out of the very hottest centre of imperialistic intrigues. It is entangled with a series of intrigues and chicanery which reach into all the Foreign Offices in Europe.
>
> "* * * If now the State Department lends itself to this dark and treacherous game, it would have plunged into the most extreme kind of Dollar Diplomacy. * * * It would confirm Mr. Hughes's title as Secretary of Oil and would put the foreign policy of this country on the very lowest plane."

The New York Evening Post (after the signing of the Lausanne Treaty):

> "* * * We refused to associate ourselves with the Allies or to act with vigor * * * [in regard to Armenia]. Our principal display of energy was in asserting certain American commercial rights which struck Europe as showing that the open-door policy can be made to cover a wonderfully wide field * * *."

Secretary **Hughes** in his New York speech:

*"Let it be understood that Turkey does not reject her international obligations. * * * Turkey should have an opportunity to show that her desire for American friendship and her willingness to protect American interests are sincere * * *."*

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:27 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Mr. **Child** in a speech, at the Lausanne Conference, December 28, 1922:

> "* * * The U. S. enjoys certain treaty rights which are obligations of Turkey, which cannot be set aside by Turkey alone, except by repudiation. * * * Nationals of the United States have invested their personal or material fortunes in Turkey. * * * The protection upon which they have counted cannot be withdrawn without the creation of an obvious injustice. * * *
>
> "* * * The position of Turkey toward the juridical status of the foreigners and their property in Turkey, as we are now led to understand it, is that Turkey asserts that she possesses a juridical system—including not only laws but their application in her courts—which will satisfy the other nations and their nationals.
>
> "Unfortunately, this satisfaction does not appear at the moment to be a fact. The fact appears to be that the other nations and their nationals are testifying that Turkey does not offer either continuance of the existing rights or the substitution for them of a system which will safeguard foreign persons and property in Turkey * * *."

On February 8, 1919, Judge Hughes characterized the Turks as murderers. On October 30, 1922, Secretary Hughes insisted on the maintenance of the capitulations. On December 28, 1922, Mr. Child repeated, in essence, Mr. Hughes' views. On August 6, 1923, Secretary Hughes signed the Lausanne Treaty, surrendering the capitulations, and on January 23, 1924, he argued the Turkish case, with religious fervor and with no greater regard for facts and truths than Ismet displayed at Lausanne, and pleaded for the friendship of the Turks!

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:28 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

A Treaty of Surrender

By A. D. F. Hamlin[1]
Dean, School of Architecture, Columbia University.

A speech delivered by Prof. Hamlin, at a mass meeting at the Metropolitan Life Auditorium, January 24, 1924, to protest against the Lausanne Treaty.

The treaty, signed on August 6th, is before the Senate. Shall we ratify it? Ought we to ratify it? That is the question.

My answer is NO. It grieves me to stand here and again publicly protest, for I am urged by old and valued friends, men of great honor and influence, to keep quiet. But I cannot agree to stand silent while my country tamely bends the knee to Kemal and Ismet. I cannot, without a protest, see our flag lowered, so to speak, in what seems to me abject surrender before the Crescent. I cannot believe that the situation is so hopeless, that we are so helpless, so completely in the power of the Turks, that we must accept what they deign to offer, and on their own terms. The Treaty is iniquitous, and we should make it plain to Turkey that we so consider it.

Let us talk calmly about it. I have had one long letter from Dr. Barton and two from Dr. Gates, protesting against my attitude.[2] I observe, however, that three U. S. ex-Ambassadors to Turkey are on my side, and three ex-Ambassadors to other Powers. I have read Secretary Hughes' defense of the Treaty published today. It is the best argument that could be made, but what sorry admissions one reads between its lines! I am going to read you the letter I received today from Dr. Gates, President of Robert College, who sits in the chair established and made great by my revered father. He writes with deep sincerity; he is in dead earnest; he is a man of wide experience, a veteran in the field, and what he says deserves the most serious attention. It presents the same arguments as those of Secretary Hughes, in briefer form. If we cannot meet his arguments, then the Treaty should be ratified, and we should confess our surrender, and send an Ambassador to do the best

[1] Professor Hamlin was born in Turkey in 1855. He is the son of the revered Dr. Cyrus Hamlin—the great pioneer missionary and educator—who has left the impress of his great personality upon the institutions and traditions of missionary work in the Near East. Dr. Hamlin founded, in 1863, Robert College, and became its first president.

[2] During the sessions of the Lausanne Conference, a dispatch to the New York Times quoted Dr. Barton as being deeply humiliated at the role which the American observers were playing. Since his return to America, he has expressed himself, orally and in writing, both for and against the Lausanne Treaty. For Dr. Gates' views upon Kemalist Turkey, see page 21.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:28 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

he can under the Treaty and the present Government of Turkey. Then we can go about our business, let the Armenians go about theirs and the Turks about theirs, and like Pilate wash our hands and say, "We are guiltless of the blood of that righteous nation."

(*Dr. Gates' letter*)

Jan. 11, 1924.

My dear Prof. Hamlin:

Your letter of December 20th, is received. I have read it carefully and it seems to me that you do not understand the situation out here. It must be clear to everyone that we could not get any better Treaty with Turkey than the Allies did. If the Turks had granted us any special terms, the Allies would have immediately have claimed the same for themselves. From the very beginning of the Lausanne Conference, this was perfectly plain to all of us there.

In the second place, if the Treaty between the United States and Turkey should be rejected, the status quo could *not* be maintained with a High Commissioner here. Already the Turkish Government has dropped the name and title of High Commissioner in dealing with the foreign representatives here and they certainly would not permit the continuance of an American High Commissioner after the Allies had regularized their diplomatic relations.

In the third place, if we reject the Treaty, we should be in the position of claiming that the capitulations are still in force. This, the Turks absolutely reject and if any case should arise, we would be in no position to enforce it. America has refused and will refuse to go to war with Turkey in order to enforce her claims and if England and France ratify their Treaties, abolishing the capitulations, and we persist in claiming that the capitulations are in force, we should be placed in a ridiculous position.

In the fourth place, the rejection of the Treaty would be sure to subject us all over here to persistent interference and opposition from the Turkish government and instead of improving the position of Robert College and of all American interests in Turkey, it would work to their positive and immediate disadvantage.

I cannot help thinking that you have been very much misinformed in regard to conditions here. Whether we like it or not, Turkey has claimed and obtained the position of a sovereign nation and has thrown off the shackles with which the European nations have bound her. They persistently used their power to the disadvantage of Turkey and they never inter-

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:29 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

fered without making the conditions of the Christians here worse instead of better. Now whether we approve of Turkey or not, we must recognize that we cannot overthrow her sovereignty unless we are willing to make supreme sacrifices to that end. If I understand the American people, they are not ready to make any such sacrifice and I feel sure that the policy which you recommend would put an end to our work in Turkey sooner or later if it were persisted in.

I am sorry to find myself in complete disagreement with you in regard to the policy to be followed.

(Signed) C. F. GATES.

Dr. Gates makes four points.

1. *"We cannot get any better treaty than the Allies did."*

If this is true, then we are indeed a poor and helpless nation. We have cut loose from the Allies, we are not to be bound by their ways. We must keep out of the League for fear of being forced to do what we don't want to—but, when we deal with Turkey, we must be bound by *their* terms! It is true, we have no territorial nor political aspirations there. True, we took no Turkish provinces away as England, France and Italy have done. True, as Secretary Hughes observes, that we did not join the Allies in war on Turkey. But all that must count for nothing! Is American diplomacy so bankrupt that it cannot and dare not claim for itself what is its clear right for fear the Allies, without such basis, will demand the same? What becomes of our independence?

2. *"If the Treaty be rejected the status quo could not be maintained with a High Commissioner."*

Why not? *"The Turkish Government has dropped the name and title of High Commissioner in dealing with the other nations and they would not permit the continuance of an American High Commissioner after the Allies had regularized their diplomatic relations."* Who would not—the Turks? I don't believe that. Why should they? The Allies have ratified the Treaty, we have not. Our position is not the same as theirs. Let the Turkish Government drop the title, they would still have to deal with some agent of the U. S. government. They surely would not be so foolish as to alienate their one friend and possible future helper by refusing to deal with us on any matter through any agent. Who would then be the worst loser? Turkey needs our favor far more than we need hers.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:31 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

3. Rejection of the Treaty," says Dr. Gates, *"leaves us in the position of claiming the capitulations are still in force. This the Turks absolutely reject,"* and as we will not go to war over the capitulations *"if England and France ratify * * * abolishing the capitulations and we persist in claiming they are still in force, we should be placed in a ridiculous position."*

I say NO; we would be placed in a position of dignity and self-respect. Both Secretary Hughes and Dr. Gates seem to assume that war is the only alternative. I think they have forgotten both American history and American diplomacy. There are compromises and devices to save every difficult diplomatic situation. If any judicial case should arise between Turkey and the United States during the present *status quo* it would surely be settled without war. But have we become so pusillanimous that we are afraid to display force if necessity really should arise? Have we ever refused to fight when necessity arose? Spain thought we would never fight over Cuba; so did we—till the Maine was blown up. Germany was sure we would never fight her, and so were many of us—until the submarine warfare. We have other ways of securing justice that we shall exhaust before we fight, but fight we will if fight we must and it is rank folly to tell the Turks that we will never fight and thus arm their obstinacy with new strength.[1]

The Treaty must be rejected because it is an infamy, a piece of national cowardice, and a symptom of moral bankruptcy. And if any new agreement is sought with that farcical "Republic"—if it lasts long enough for us to negotiate a new agreement with it—*there should be at least a formal declaration of our benevolent interest in the integrity and independence of Armenia, so that we may give some evidence that the protestations of Wilson and Harding and of Hughes really meant what they seemed to mean.* Otherwise we shall stand among the other powers disgraced by their cowardice and greed. Let the Treaty be rejected, that we may hold up our heads in the consciousness of our national sincerity and self-respect.

[1] The proponents of the Treaty admit that it is not a good treaty; but, they contend that it offers an opportunity for future negotiations.

No continuity of relations is necessary to start negotiations with another nation toward resumption of formal relations. The time to secure concessions is before and not after concluding a treaty. If we grant the Turks recognition on their own terms, what possible reason would induce them to make any concessions to us afterward? If we must yield to them now because they will not—if they know that they can have their way by merely refusing to yield—it is obvious that in order to secure any concession from them in the future we must make further concessions to them—perhaps, a loan.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:32 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

It Dishonors America

By Col. John Price Jackson

Member of the American (Harbord) Military Mission to Turkey and Armenia in 1919.

I do not believe the United States Senate can afford to ratify the Lausanne Treaty until it has been modified in a way more adequately to guarantee the safety of the persons and property of our nationals and others in whom we are interested in Turkey.

By ratification of the Treaty as recommended, we should fail properly to support our own citizens and interests and would indirectly, but effectively, aid in perpetuating conditions of injustice in the Near East, of a character which is revolting to American spirit and principles. By such action we should leave practically unrestrained power, so far as the United States is concerned, in the hands of those who have shown themselves in the past as being incapable or unwilling to use it in a way adequately to protect the lives and property of our citizens and those whom we have, as a people, for decades been succoring in their need—*races which inhabited the land before the Turks.*

Acceptance of this Treaty would, in effect, be our acknowledgment that we are willing to set up friendly official relations and agreements with another nation, of a character which would offer little or no restraint to prevent treatment of those of foreign nationality or religion, including our own nationals, in a way which would be abhorrent to us.

The monstrosities and massacres in Turkey during the war have been incalculably more terrible than those of earlier days, which caused our people to be aghast, and terrible massacres have been carried through since the war.

Notwithstanding these facts, the framers of the treaty are apparently willing to renounce even the right to speak for the unhappy remnants of the Christians, and they are committing the incredible folly of accepting Turkish promises and laws in lieu of the capitulations, without which our nationals in Turkey shall be subjected to the unrestrained lust and caprice of Turkish officials.

We refuse to recognize Russia largely because she will not pay her pre-war debts and show reasonable respect for the rights of others and their property; yet in the case of Turkey, whom our Allies defeated with our indirect but invaluable help,

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:32 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

and who has shown through centuries positive and terrible evidence of failure to respect not only property but lives, the treaty makers propose that we voluntarily remove all restraining conditions in our agreement.

Should such an action have been proposed before the war, a political upheaval would have been caused in this country.

My own opinion is formed by extended study of the subject and an investigation on the ground. When a member of the Military Mission sent to Turkey in the summer of 1919 to investigate conditions and report to the President, I traveled several thousand miles through the Turkish peninsula. During this time I observed inconceivable misery among the remnants of the millions who had been driven into exile under conditions that appeared to have been incomprehensible and wanton brutality.

I saw the Turks taking the homes and well-planted fields of those they had driven out. I also saw and spoke to tens of thousands of exiles, mostly women and children, camping on the foothills and slopes of Mount Ararat, without shelter from the bitter winters, without fuel, and with but the starvation rations of food which American generosity had, at that time, been able to get through to them.

I saw a great number dying and many dead with none to bury them. I saw groups of others of non-Turkish nationality and religion who had been unable to get away, traveling by stealth at night, toward the Black Sea, in the hope of freeing themselves from the danger which threatened them.[1]

---

[1] See, Report of the American Military Mission to Armenia, presented to the Senate, April 13, 1920.

In August, 1919, an American Mission of 26 members, known as "American Military Mission to the Near East," and headed by Major-General John G. Harbord, was sent by President Wilson to the Near East—Turkey, Armenia and the Russian Trans-Caucasus,—with instructions to "investigate and report on political, military, geographical, administrative, economic and other considerations involved * * *," with a view to determining the proposition if whether or not America should accept a mandate in that region.

The Mission traveled, in seven weeks, about 10,000 miles. It confirmed the report of Turkish massacres of Armenians, placing the number of the victims at 6 to 800,000. It made no recommendation for or against a mandate. But, it did express the opinion that if America would consider accepting a mandate in that region, such a mandate should include the whole of Turkey, except the Arabic speaking districts, and the Russian Trans-Caucasus. These territories embrace an area of about 400,000 sq. miles, and had an estimated popula-

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:32 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

There is another phase of this subject which demands consideration and cannot fail to touch every red-blooded American. General Allenby, of the English Army, has said that the small ragged army of Armenians operating on the northern flank of the Turkish Army so worried his antagonist that he was able to cause the early capitulation of the Turkish nation. This little army fought under almost insuperable difficulties and with but meagre supplies and suffered enormous casualties. If we ratify this Treaty without an amendment we, as a nation, will be turning our backs upon those in that valiant army. Further, had they not done their duty so heroically and well at a critical place and time the war would most likely have lasted another year. The result of this would have been that grave markers for five or ten Americans would now be standing

---

tion of over 15,000,000,—divided into six major ethnic and linguistic groups. The Mission estimated the cost of administration of the proposed unitary mandate at $756,014,000, spread over a period of five years, and advocated the sending over of 59,000 American troops,—this number to be reduced 50%, at the end of three years. No deduction of the revenues was made in the estimated cost of administration, which would equal, perhaps, the expenditures.

The territory which the Sevres Treaty subsequently allotted to Armenia has an area of 66,000 sq miles, or less than one-sixth of the area embraced in the mandate contemplated by Gen. Harbord's report.

The Armenians chiefly required, and now require, moral and financial assistance. They needed a few battalions of foreign troops, pending the completion of the organization of their own army,—and particularly for the moral effect that the presence of foreign troops would have upon their neighbors,—and a loan of $25,000,000.

In the Versailles Treaty, Germany covenants to pay the Allies, on account of Turkey, 6,500,000 Turkish gold pounds, or $29,250,000. Also, in that Treaty, Portugal, who contributed to the Allied Armies one-twentieth of the number of men Armenia contributed, receives ¾% of the German reparations. Had Armenia received only one-third of the share of Portugal, her share would have been about $40,000,000, and that would have solved the financial part of her problem. America, as one of the principal Allied (Associated) Powers could, and should, have acted as sponsor for Armenia in this matter.

Armenia is essentially an agricultural country. It has a rich soil, a vigorous climate and abundant natural resources. Its three plains—Bassène, Alashguerd and Musch—have a producing capacity of 2,000,000 tons of foodstuff, and there are 750 known locations of mineral resources within its borders, including oil, copper, coal, iron, salt, silver, gold, etc. The Armenian oil, stretching over an area of 220 miles long—a continuation of the Baku oil fields—is said to be one of the richest deposits in the world.—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:33 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

overseas where one now stands and instead of a debt of twenty billions of dollars, we would now be laboring under one of twice that size.[1]

Purely from the standpoint of selfish international policy I believe that we should protect ourselves more fully than is done in this Treaty in its present form.

In my judgment it would be wiser to test Turkey as we are testing Russia until we have received positive evidence that she has acceptably modified the practices and attitudes shown by her for centuries—that pending such test we should not relax our pre-war requirements of her.

I personally hope and believe that all America hopes, that Turkey will develop and maintain the standards of equal justice in regard to life and property which we in America believe we have the right to demand of those nations with which we have official and commercial relationship and that she, as a nation, will prosper; but such wishes do not warrant us in setting up unguarded relationships with another nation where in the past acceptable standards have not been maintained, unless we have previously received full and sufficient guarantees that they will be hereafter maintained.

---

[1] *Gen. Allenby* said:

"I am proud to have Armenian contingents under my command. They fought brilliantly and took a leading part in the victory."

Gen. von Sanders, German Commander in Syria, said:

"The collapse of the Turkish Palistinian front was due to the fact that the Turks, against my orders and advice, sent forces to the Caucasus, where they fought the Armenians." (Following the defection of Russia.)

Lord Robert Cecil said:

"In the beginning of the War, the Russian Armenians organized volunteer forces, which bore the brunt of some of the heaviest fighting in the Caucasian campaign. After the Russian Army's breakdown, (Oct. 1917) the Armenians took over the Caucasus front; (over 200 miles long) fought the Turks for five months, and thus rendered very important services to the British Army in Mesopotamia."

Gen. von Ludendorff, in his book, says:

"The principal factor that forces the breakdown of the German Army on the Western front was due to the lack of fuel supply, because the Turks did not get to Baku in time." (They were held back by the Armenians.

Of the 900 Armenian volunteers in the Foreign Legion (France) 865 have been killed. Over 200,000 Armenians fought as independent units or in the ranks of the Allied armies. Over 75,000 Armenians have been killed in battle.)

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:33 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

American Missionary Interests in Turkey

* * *

American missionaries began their work in Turkey in 1831. During that period they have converted but a handful of Moslems who, however, have not dared to profess it openly. Apostacy constitutes a capital crime in Islam, and the apostate is punished by death. In consequence, so long as there is a Turkish State, it is manifestly impossible for Christianity to advance among the Turks.

Until 1910, even the educational work of our missionaries was almost entirely confined to the non-Moslem communities. Between 1910 and 1922, the number of Turks attending American schools varied from one to twenty.

In a report made in 1923, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions presented the following facts upon the present status of its work in Turkey:

Missionary Churches: 90 per cent. closed
American Colleges (8): Work suspended in 6
Hospitals (10): One-half operating
College Heads: 2 dead, 1 deported, 3 refused permission to return
High Schools: Only 3 out of 41 now open
Village schools: (Estimated at 1,000) Abandoned
Property loss: Estimated at $2,880,000
Native workers: Two-thirds dead; others in exile
Constituency: 95 per cent. dead or deported or enslaved in harems
American workers: 50 deported.

There are now remaining only 12 stations in Turkey: i. e., Constantinople, Smyrna, Brusa, Cesarea, Marsivan, Konia, Adana, Aintab, Marash, Mardin, Tarsus and Mersina.

Except in the two colleges in Constantinople, where the enrollment has been reduced by nearly 50%, the work that is being done in the other stations named is but nominal. In the College of Smyrna, which has been least affected, the student body of 1,000 has dropped to 100. In Constantinople, over 100 Turkish boys and girls are attending American schools.

C. H. K.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:33 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

A Purposeless and Humiliating Treaty

By Fred. Perry Powers

Editor, Philadelphia Record.[1]

President Wilson invited the belligerents to state the objects for which they were fighting, and, on January 10, 1917, Prime Minister Briand of France, delivered to the American Ambassador in Paris a statement of the eight points for which the Allies were struggling. The sixth of these was as follows:

"6. Liberation of the population subjected to the bloody tyranny of the Turks; ejection out of Europe of the Ottoman Empire as foreign to Western civilization."

A few weeks later we went to the aid of the Allies. Before the United States formally assents to the repudiation of this pledge by the Allies, and becomes a party to the abandonment of the "population subjected to the bloody tyranny of the Turks," the United States owes it to its own self-respect to obtain from the Allies some satisfactory explanation of their course.

The Allies invited the President of the United States to fix the limits of a country that should be a home-land for the Armenians. He did so. The United States is entitled to an explanation by the Allies of their failure to take any further steps in the matter.[2]

Also, President **Harding,** by a letter, dated November 26, 1921, to Mr. Gerard, said:

> *"I have your letter of November 18th. I am very happy to reply that the Cilician situation has been given*

[1] Dr. Fred Perry Powers was born in Turkey, the son of missionary parents. His fathed died and was buried there, his mother and sister also spent their lives in mission work in that country. He speaks not only with great authority on the subject, but he interprets the traditional sentiment of the great American missionary pioneers who carried into the Near East the ideas and ideals of America.

[2] The Allies have made numerous promises to the United States Government in behalf of Armenia, which, however, they have failed to carry out, and they have put the blame for their omissions upon America.

Before the Lausanne Conference, Secretary Hughes said that America recognized Armenia as her ally and that she would fulfill the duty which she owed her as an ally.

So far as is known, the present Department of State has done absolutely nothing toward the performance of this Government's duty to Armenia, as an ally or otherwise.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:35 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

attention, and we have assurances from the proper authority (Premier Briand was then in Washington) that those stricken will not be left without military protection. I had the matter taken up through Secretary Hughes and he assured me only yesterday that everything has been done that seems necessary to do and he has the most gratifying assurances from spokesmen for our former allies abroad."[1]

The United States has not yet recognized Russia. It has but very lately recognized the Governments of Greece and Mexico. There is no reason why it should recognize the revolutionary Government in Turkey without the guarantees of the capitulations which our citizens have enjoyed for nearly a century, and which capitulations have been a part of Turkish policy for centuries, some of them going back to the time when Turkey was in the height of its power.

By the treaty of Lausanne we would recognize the revolutionary Government of Turkey as a member of the family of nations on a level with the nations of Europe. What we may expect from such a Government was set forth by M. Clemenceau, on behalf of the Council of Ten of the Peace Conference, in his address to the delegation sent by Turkey which was not admitted and was sent back to Constantinople. Damad Ferid Pasha had made an address admitting substantially the charges of perfidy against the Turks for their entrance into the war and for their conduct toward the subject population, but laying the blame upon a faction which was not then in control in Constantinople, but is now in control in Angora. In reply M. Clemenceau said, in part:

> "It is admitted, directly or by implication, that Turkey had no cause of quarrel with the Entente Powers, that she acted as the subservient tool of Germany that the war, begun without excuse and conducted without mercy, was accompanied by massacres whose calculated atrocity equals or exceeds anything in recorded history. * * *
>
> "The Council * * * wishes well to the Turkish people and admires their excellent qualities. But it cannot admit that among those qualities are to be counted capacity to the rule over alien races. The experiment has been tried too long and too often for there to be the least doubt as to its result. * * *

---

[1] France, after demobilizing the Armenian troops and after disarming the Armenians, withdrew from Cilicia, leaving the Christians at the mercy of the Turks. (See article, headed, A French Opinion on the Angora Junta, page 22). —Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:34 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

> Yet, in all these changes there is no case to be found, either in Europe, or Asia, or Africa, in which the establishment of Turkish rule in any country has not been followed by a diminiution of material prosperity and a fall in the level of culture. Nor is there any case to be found in which the withdrawal of Turkish rule has not been followed by a growth in material prosperity and a rise in the level of culture. Neither among the Christians of Europe, nor among the Moslems of Syria, Arabia and Africa, has the Turk done other than destroy wherever he has conquered. Never has he shown himself able to develop in peace what he has won by war."

These are the people to whom our citizens and our interests are to be entrusted under the treaty of Lausanne, with no more guarantees than we would ask from England or France.

Mr. Morgenthau has stated, I believe, that there is not an honest court in Turkey, from which I infer that there has been no improvement since the period, now rather remote, when I had some personal knowledge of Turkey.

Secretary Hughes urges that by ratifying this treaty we shall secure the good will of the Turks. We shall do nothing of the sort. We shall only earn their contempt for our weakness. The French editor of Le Bosphore, Constantinople, published a book a couple of years ago denouncing his country for its subservience to the Turks. He accused it of "throwing the Christians to the beasts." He said that France would not earn the good will of the Turks; it would only earn their contempt for its weakness. A few months ago a French prelate visited Turkey and Paris dispatches reported that on his return he spoke bitterly of the indignities to which he was subjected because he was a Frenchman, and he contrasted the treatment he had received with that which used to be accorded to Frenchmen. *The Turks respect only those whom they fear, or from whom they hope to receive something.*

The French sought a mandate for Cilicia and received it. Finding it difficult to hold, they threw up their mandate, accepted some mineral concessions from Mustapha Kemal, and retired from the province, abandoning the Christian population, "throwing the Christians to the beasts," and according to news dispatches 140,000 of them managed to get away, very many of them as refugees to Greece, whose Government is trying to keep them alive without help from the Allies or from the American Government.

There is no public knowledge that our Government ever protested to France against this abandonment of her mandate. Yet when a mandate affects commercial interests our Department of

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:36 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

State is alert and insistent. It refused to recognize that the British mandate for Mesopotamia shut us out from access to the oil regions. Japan received a mandate for the Island of Yap. But the Department of State recognized the importance of that island as a cable station and insisted that our rights were not affected by the mandate, and that we had a right to know everything that was done under the mandate. Japan yielded, and the following is the final paragraph of the agreement between the United States and Japan, December 12, 1921:

"(E) It is agreed that any modification in the mandate are to be subject to the consent of the United States, and, further, that Japan will address to the United States a duplicate report on the administration of the mandate."

The opinions of Dr. Barton and Dr. Gates are entitled to very serious consideration, but I cannot but think they are unduly influenced by what seem to them the immediate interests of the missionary and educational work. The future must be considered. The Turks are already imposing conditions in regard to teaching Turkish history and certain teaching by Turks, and I believe they are imposing restrictions on religious teaching. If they do this now, without diplomatic recognition or a treaty, what are they likely to do after they have secured recognition and the abrogation of the capitulations? Under the treaty they would be practically free to do whatever they like with our missions and colleges. *It is a good deal wiser to keep them wanting something, even at present loss, than to give them everything they demand.*

Whether there are enough Armenians left in the country to make the mission work important is open to some question. Our colleges will cease to be American, and will become Turkish institutions if the treaty of Lausanne be ratified.

Angora has played fast and loose with the Caliphate and it is not unlikely to be overthrown on this very issue. Within the last few weeks the leader of the Turkish bar has been sentenced to five years' imprisonment for writing a letter to the Caliph that Angora appointed, urging him not to resign because it would involve the interests of the dynasty and of their religion. This is the sort of administration of justice to which our interests are to be resigned. One may infer from this that Mustapha Kemal desires his creature, who, I think, is Abdul Medjid, a member of the imperial family, to resign. News dispatches say that four or five other Turks of high rank are in prison on account of some action concerning the so-

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:37 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

called Caliph. There is intense hostility toward Mustapha Kemal on account of the Caliphate.[1]

Islam has no hierarchy like that of the Catholic Church, and the Caliph does not correspond to the Pope. The Sultans of Turkey base their claim to the Caliphate on a cession from a subordinate, a sort of court chaplain, of the conquered Sultans of Egypt. The Arabs, who hate the Turks, do not recognize the Turkish Sultans as Caliphs. The Shiite sect, which includes the Persians and ten or twelve millions of Moslems in India, do not recognize him. The orthodox Moslems of India, about 60,000,000, cared so little about the Turkish Caliphate that Indian Moslems fought for George V against Mohammed V throughout the world war, although the Sultan proclaimed a Holy War.

Nevertheless, the unpardonable delay in dictating peace to Turkey was utilized by Mustapha Kemal, who sent agents to India to excite the Moslems there in the interest of the Sultan as Caliph and this action is said to have played some part in the omission of the British Government to fulfil its war pledges regarding Turkey.

The Angora regime has not yet demonstrated its capacity to remain in control. There are not lacking indications that it is insecure. We cannot afford to tie ourselves up with Mustapha Kemal in his present precarious position, for whatever concessions we make to him will be claimed by any Turkish authority that succeeds him.

Our oil companies existed and apparently did business in Mexico while we refused to recognize the Mexican Government. We did not recognize it until the Department of State got its terms. The Department announces that it will not recognize the Government in Russia until it gets its terms. Why should we make haste to recognize the usurper in Angora on his own terms?

The Allies do not rely entirely upon their treaty of Lausanne. They rely upon their military and naval means of coercion if the Turk behaves badly. But we are not likely to use those means, and the Turks know it and will take advantage of it. We are going to rely upon a mere piece of paper. We had better withdraw Americans from Turkey than to leave them at the mercy of Turkish courts. Our religious, educational and commercial interests would be as safe with no treaty as they would be under the treaty of Lausanne with no military and naval forces behind it.

[1] This article was written over two weeks before the abolition of the Caliphate by Kemal on March 3, 1924.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:37 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Christianity Extinguished in Asia Minor

"* * * One aspect, and only one, of the situation engages the attention of the present article—the developments which affect Christianity. Within the bounds of the former Ottoman Empire the Christian religion had its rise and its growth. Inside the limits of the present new Turkey, Christianity became an empire.

When I recently traveled from Constantinople to Angora, and from Angora to Smyrna, I passed through most of the "Seven Churches of Asia," as well as all the cities where the historic Christian Church Councils were held. During a large part of the time I was walking in the footsteps of the Apostle Paul and the Apostle John and their associates.

The Christian Church, planted personally in the region that is now called Turkey by the Apostle Paul and his associates, Barnabas, Silas, Luke, Mark and Timothy, and later overseen and beloved by the aged Apostle John, is now practically eliminated. Only in a few points, like Tarsus and Aintab and Caesarea, do a handful of Christians hold on in a semi-secrecy and in fear of the same fate that has befallen their brethren.

The Church in Turkey has been wiped out, just as the Catholic Church was wiped out in Japan, as the Nestorian Church was wiped out in China, and as the early Church was wiped out in Western Persia and Arabia. What all the tides of invasion from East and West could not do—what the Caesars and the Moslems and Tamerlane and Ghengis Khan and Mohammed Ali and scores of other conquerors could not accomplish—extinguish the flame of Christian worship and faith in Asia Minor—has now been wrought.

In the Bible lands where Apostles and saints labored; where dwelt 'the Seven Churches of Asia,' to which the Book of Revelations was addressed; and where sat the great historic Church Councils, which formulated the creeds still confessed weekly in churches of all Christendom; and where Christianity became an empire, there today the Christian congregations and their priests have been scattered, and many of the church buildings have been burned to the ground. Turkey in Asia is now exclusively 'Turkey for the Turks.' Altogether, according to the best estimates I could gather while traveling through the interior of Turkey, the aggregate number of Christians of every name in all Anatolia is less than 50,000. A short time ago they numbered millions.

Still nearer home to Americans is the further fact that the American missionaries, after 100 years of service, are now out of Asiatic Turkey, their schools and hospitals empty, and their flock scattered. There are only a handful of American missionaries now holding on in Turkey, outside of Constantinople. Much of the missionary work

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:37 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

was educational; and American institutions were established at Harpoot, Aintab, Marsovan, Caesarea, Marash, Tarsus, Smyrna and other cities. The general body of students in each case was Christian, so that the exodus of Greeks and Armenians has closed nearly all of these institutions. Robert College and The American College for Women, being in Constantinople, are in a somewhat different case, and are carrying on, but with an enrollment cut down one half. Hospitals are for the most part closed, as the Angora Government will not grant licenses to foreign physicians. Even the few American doctors and missionaries still there are facing restrictions that seem likely to crowd them out."—WILLIAM T. ELLIS, *in the New York Times.*

We Should Not Surrender to a Tottering Regime

By WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS

Professor of History, University of Minnesota.

I am opposed to the ratification by the Senate of the Lausanne Treaty upon the following grounds:

We should not surrender treaty rights which have belonged to American nationals in Turkey for the last ninety years, at the very time when recent events have demonstrated it more needful than ever those rights should be maintained.

We should not do this at a time when grave public events are causing a national scrutiny of those "economic" interests which were alleged to have been so active at Lausanne.

We should not do this when the Kemalist regime with which we compounded is showing unmistakable signs of being a one-man government, subject to all the catastrophies of tyrannies and dictatorships, and particularly liable to be overthrown by un uprising any day.

We should not do this while the so-called Nationalist government is clearly such an unsteady experiment that a quarrel with the United States would be so ruinous, so direct an invitation for every kind of foreign demand and domestic disorder, that a defiance of American rights would be unthinkable—unless indeed Washington served notice in advance that American rights will not be maintained.

We should not do this because there exists no present necessity to extend the hand of national friendship to rulers who,

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:37 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

whatever their gracious manners and benevolent language, have immediately behind them a record of rulthlessness and deliberate human destruction without parallel in any land, not even in distracted Russia, to which we steadily refuse official recognition.

* * *

Great Britain, France and Italy, in order to put an end to Turkish propaganda in the territories which have been severed from Turkey—Mesopotamia, Syria, Tripoli and the Islands—may deem it advisable to enter into a truce with Angora, but America has no reason whatever to buy the favor of the Turk.

America has no interest in Turkey that can possibly suffer by maintaining the status quo. In 1913, when Turkey had an estimated population of 18,000,000—now reduced to 5,000,000, —American exports to Turkey amounted to 16 cents per capita of the population of that country. American missionary activities have, as a result of the practical elimination of the Christians, been reduced by over 90%. The fundamental question at issue is one of moral principle and of American honor. Ratification of the Treaty would be tantamount to a solemn acceptance of calculated murder of whole populations as a policy of governments.

It is impossible for American nationals—missionaries or traders—to reside in Turkey without the protection of the capitulations which have afforded the only safeguard against the oppressive Turkish laws, and corrupt police and courts. Once the Treaty has been ratified, the Turks will naturally treat our nationals as they do their own, and, as Ambassador Straus has aptly stated that their own have no rights nor protection as we understand the words.

Our few remaining nationals in Turkey—if they should choose to stay, would be no worse off without a Treaty than with this Lausanne Treaty, because in any event it is stated they will enjoy the "protection" of Turkish laws. They would perhaps be better off without any treaty that definitely subjects them to such laws, because the Turks would very likely exercise some measure of prudence and restraint with a view of ultimately securing American recognition.

The Kemalists have been more destructive than either the Old Turks or the Young Turks, and they are even more corrupt, because of the hopeless economic chaos, as a result of the elimination of the Christians—the producers—which now prevails in Turkey. This condition, aggravated by the increas-

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:38 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

ing factional strife, must inevitably and shortly result in the downfall of the Angora regime. It is manifestly unwise for America to make to the Angora junta any concession, as such concession its successors will naturally seek to retain.

Any favorable opinion, concerning either the Angora regime or the Lausanne Treaty, which may be expressed by certain good Americans, who have relations with Turkey, must be interpreted as reflecting the absence of any freedom of speech in Turkey, and as a necessary and studied act to escape the wrath of the Turks. Foreigners, as the few remaining native Christians, are hostages.

The presence of our missionaries or of our flag in Turkey cannot, in the slightest degree, exert any beneficent influence upon the Turks in their treatment of the few remaining native Christians, any more now than in 1915 when the Turks slaughtered 800,000 Armenians—when we permitted our flag and our authorities to be mocked and defied in the supposed interest of such protection.

For these reasons, and for many more equally weighty, the United States Senate owes it to itself and to the American people, to reject the humiliating and purposeless Treaty of Lausanne.

An Unchristian Compact

By F. G. Smith, D.D.

President, Missionary Board of the Church of God.

My own personal experiences in Turkey impel me, in the name of justice and American honor, to protest against ratification by the Senate of the Lausanne Treaty negotiated by the United States and Turkey on August 6, 1923.

Unless the rights of the Armenians outlined in the Sevres Treaty (August 10, 1920), are recognized, the protection and full civil and religious liberties of the other Christian minorities definitely assured, and the unrestricted freedom of American missionary institutions in Turkey (as well as the rights of other American nationals) guaranteed by consular jurisdiction as in the past, the Government of the United States should absolutely refuse to conclude any treaty with the assassins of the Near East now designated by the misnomer "Turkish Republic."

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:38 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Objections to the Lausanne Treaty

By Oscar S. Straus

Ex-Ambassador to Turkey

From an address by Mr. Straus, at the Yale Club, on November 24, 1923.

The system of capitulations was a necessary result of the absence of a competent and even handed judiciary. Justice was sold to the highest bidder. And a nation does not turn a new leaf over night. * * * I congratulate the Turks on having written the best one sided bargain in international treaty making. * * * The treaty proposes that Americans shall have the same rights in Turkey as the natives. The irony of this is that the natives have no rights. And what has Turkey hitherto done with agreements? She has never kept one and does not know how to. We would be better off without any agreement with Turkey at all. In that event, our hand would be just as free as the Turkish hand which, under the circumstances, will be free anyway. If the Senate ratifies this Treaty, we will be thrown into the maelstrom of Europe.

Origin of Capitulations

Mohammed II, Conqueror of Constantinople (1453), initiated the system of capitulations, which his successors confirmed and enlarged by Treaties or Imperial Firmans, dated 1535, 1569, 1581, 1597, 1604, 1678, 1740, 1802, etc. By a Treaty, signed at Constantinople, on May 7, 1920, the United States gained the advantages of the capitulatory system, which, however, the Turks abrogated on September 28, 1914.

The system was divided into two parts: Judicial and Economic.

Judicial: Civil cases, involving ten Turkish pounds, between a foreigner and a Turk, were tried before a Turkish Court, in the presence of the dragoman of the interested Consulate, and those involving more than ten pounds were tried before a Mixed Tribunal, composed of a Turkish presiding judge, and two Turkish and two foreign members. Civil cases between foreigners of the same nationality and those between foreigners of different nationalities were tried by Consular Courts, except cases involving real estate, which were tried by Turkish courts. Also, criminal cases, involving foreigners of different na-

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

tionalities and those involving a Turk and a foreigner were tried before Turkish Courts, ordinarily in the presence of the dragoman of the Consulate involved.

Economic: Foreigners were exempt from Ottoman taxes, except customs duties and land taxes. In common, however, with Turkish nationals, they paid indirect taxes levied by the Administration of Public Debt (an institution representing the foreign creditors of Turkey which administers the public debt of Turkey, amounting to $700,000,000, and which function Turkey voluntarily entrusted to it in 1881) on tobacco, spirits, salt, silks, etc. They were exempt from a multitude of 'customary' or local taxes, which far exceeded in volume the legitimate taxes. These are, in reality, tributes, exacted from the Christians for road-building, and for the erection of public buildings, which were never built; for the repair of Mosques and Turkish schools, etc., etc., which found their way into the pockets of the rulers.

Taxes were collected from the Christians once, twice, three times, by the Central Government, by Provincial Governors and their lieutenants, by district leaders, by tribal chiefs, indeed, by anyone who could display a badge of authority. Foreigners were free from the arbitrary acts and exactions of the Turkish authorities, to which they must now submit as a result of the abrogation of the capitulations.

The system of capitulations was not exacted by force or diplomacy, but granted in the period when Turkey was the most powerful state in Europe. It constituted a fundamental contract between the Turkish Government and foreign governments. One reason for it was to attract foreign capital and enterprise to Turkey. Another was that Turkish law is based upon the Koranic law (Sheriat laws), and under these laws the testimony of a Christian is not admissible against that of a Moslem. Apart from the necessity, from a legal point of view, of retaining the capitulations, there exists an even greater reason for them, namely, the absence of a proper judiciary, in any civilized sense of the term. The great majority of Turkish judges are Imams and Muftis, (clergy) who adhere strictly to the Koranic laws. Moreover, the system of bribery is so strongly entrenched that justice is entirely unattainable even by a Turk. Citizens are arrested on trumped up charges and cases are dragged on indefinitely, as a means of furnishing excuse for bribe taking. All litigation is juggled through the hands of the police, executive officials and judges, who must be paid for their "services." Such "services" are chiefly delays, obstructions and intimidation. Nearly one million out of the five million population of Turkey is composed of officials and their families. There are perhaps three times more officials than are needed. They are never paid regularly, since the revenues of the Government in the past amounted to less than two-thirds of its expenditures, and this condition is now even worse, as a result of the elimination of the Christians, who were the chief producers of wealth.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

The Unspeakable Turk

By Charles W. Eliot

President-Emeritus, Harvard University.

To my thinking the treatment of the Armenians by the Harding Administration has been shameful, and the readmission of the Turk to Europe the worst calamity which has befallen Europe and Asia since that premature armistice.

How strange it is that nobody gives the real reason why we should have nothing to do with the Turks! The present Turks are the descendants and heirs of those Turks who for centuries have harassed and butchered the Christian populations within their borders, and are themselves continuing the same practices to an even more revolting degree.

Why does not somebody speak out clearly and strongly upon these facts?

The Turks

By Charles H. Kirby

The Turks, a Mongolian race from Central Asia, in the 3rd century, established a great Empire, extending from Manchuria to India. They embraced Mohammedanism in the 8th century, and, in the 11th, conquered Syria, Mesopotamia and Persia. At this time, Asia Minor was divided between Byzantium and Armenia. Between 1048 and 1071, while the armies of Byzantium were engaged in the northwest against the inroads of the Slavs, continuous forays were made by the nomadic Turkish tribes into eastern Asia Minor, until the population was exterminated and the country made desolate. Before the coming of the Turks, Asia Minor had an estimated population of 32,000,000—today reduced to approximately 5,000,000. (John Foord).[1]

[1]The Turks of Turkey are basically of the most primitive and backward branch of the Mongolian race. Upon that stock is grafted a hodge podge of renegades, slaves, captives and forced converts, drawn from all the races bordering upon the Mediterranean and Black Seas. There is also a large element provided by black slaves from the Soudan and Central Africa. The piratical monopoly of those seas which was held by the Turks for so many centuries, down even to

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:39 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Some observers lend support to the Turkish contention that their massacres of the Christians was their answer to the instigation of the foreign Powers; that presence in Turkey of Christians is a proof of Turkish tolerance, and, further, that the sterility of Turkish rule has been due to the interferences of the Powers in Turkish affairs.

Massacre and plunder have always been the established policy of Turkey.

The natural policy of the Turks was to prey upon their civilized neighbors; increase their fighting forces, and secure ample revenues for their maintenance and for the prosecution of further warlike adventures. Accordingly, after each conquest, they resorted to massacre, seizure of women and children for their harems and to the sale of multitudes of all classes into slavery. They also compelled some of the terrified communities to embrace Islam, but obviously, the total destruction of the subject races would have dried up the economic resources upon which they depended.

The Turkish government was primarily a military organization, and ill-suited to the performance of administrative functions; therefore, the Sultans found it necessary to extend official recognition to the Greek and Armenian Patriarchs, and to use the machinery of the Churches for the collection of taxes.

The savagery of the Turks may be illustrated by such instances as the following: In 1048 they massacred 100,000 and enslaved 50,000 Christians at Erzerum. In 1453, Mahomet massacred and enslaved nearly the whole surviving population of Constantinople, and allotted the nuns to the Dervishes, turning the convents over to scenes of lust and outrage. In 1526, Suleyman, in one of his fifteen invasions of Hungary, massacred 200,000 and enslaved 100,000 of the inhabitants. In 1570, Selim massacred 30,000 and took 2,000 captives at Nicosia. In 1683 Kara Mustapha massacred 30,000 at the outskirts of Vienna. These instances of atrocities, perpetrated at

---

the middle of the 19th century, was a magnet which drew the lawless and criminal from all parts of the world. Of this blending of the primitive, the savage, the stupidly brutal and atavistic products is composed the Turk of today. The retention by him of his primordial traits is explained by the Mendellian Law, which, as applied to anthropology, is stated by Madison Grant in the following terms: "* * * the result of the mixture of two races, in the long run, gives us a race reverting to the more ancient, generalized and lower type." —Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:40 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

a time when Turkey was supreme, are but a few of numberless ones.

In 1338 Orkhan, the Second Sultan of Turkey, inaugurated the system of Janissaries. Under that system the Turkish Government, throughout a period of 310 years, forcibly tore Christian children of tender years from their parents; reared them as Moslems, and formed of them a military corps, known as Janissaries, who constituted the mainstay of the armies of Turkey.

In the period of 385 years (1389-1774), Turkish power was supreme and unchallenged. During that entire period they gave nothing to civilization, but, on the contrary, plunged into barbarism those lands which had, until their advent, led the world in the arts of civilized life.

There was no community of interest in this heterogeneous empire. The Government saw in the numerical and economic growth of the Christians possible elements of danger to its authority.

For its light upon the position of the Christians, we may cite the following petition which they addressed to the Sultan in 1803, complaining that

"* * * they were attacked in their religion, their morality, and their honor. No husband was secure as to his wife, no father as to his daughter, no brother as to his sister * * *."

Between 1821 and 1914, the Turks massacred Greeks, Nestorians, Maronites, Bulgarians, Serbs, Armenians, Macedonians, Albanians and Arabs.

They did not conquer all the Armenians until 1915. According to Lord Bryce, during the 19th century the Armenians of Zeitun (Cilicia) won 65 battles against them and preserved their autonomy. The first Armenian revolutionary body was organized in 1880, for the purpose of prevailing upon the Powers to have the Sultan carry out the 61st Article of the Treaty of Berlin (1878) which provided for the inauguration of certain reform measures in Armenia.

The Young Turks, nine months after their accession to power, massacred, without any excuse or provocation (see Gibbon's, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire), 30,000 Christians in Cilicia; and, during the war, they massacred, with the deliberate purpose of solving the Armenian problem by extermination, 800,000 Armenians and about 250,000 Greeks. (See, Morgenthau's book, Harbord's report, and the reports of Wangenheim and Wolff-Metternich, German Ambassadors

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:40 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

at Constantinople).[1] According to reliable information, over 200,000 Christian women and children are now slaves in Turkish harems.

The Kemalists, during their four years of rule, have slaughtered over 300,000 Armenians and 1,000,000 Greeks. (*See page 63*).

For the first time in 2,000 years, Christianity has been destroyed in Asia Minor,—the lamps of the Seven Churches now lie broken and extinguished.

---

[1] Telegram from Ambassador Wangenheim to Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg, dated June 7, 1915: ". . . The Government (Turkish) is really pursuing the fixed purpose of exterminating the Armenian race in Turkey."

Telegram from Ambassador Wolff-Metternich to the Chancellor, dated July 10, 1916: ". . . The Turkish Government cannot be prevailed upon to abandon the execution of its plan, which is the solution of the Armenian question by the extermination of the Armenian race."

U. OF ILL. LIB.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:40 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

A Memorandum—*AGAINST RATIFICATION BY THE SENATE OF THE LAUSANNE TREATY, NEGOTIATED BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TURKEY, AT LAUSANNE, ON AUGUST 6, 1923.*

* * *

I.

The Lausanne Treaty surrenders the legitimate and essential rights and interests of America in Turkey, and nullifies President Harding's pledge to Armenia.

On October 30, 1922, the Department of State laid down seven subjects, in which America was interested in respect of Turkey. *They were:*

1. Capitulations. They are relinquished by the Lausanne Treaty. Our nationals in Turkey are to be deprived of the protection of the American Consular Courts—a prerogative which they have enjoyed since 1830—and are made subject to the jurisdiction of the notoriously corrupt Turkish police and Courts. (The Near East Relief Society has already found it necessary to transfer its center of activities—headquarters, orphanages and stores—from Turkey to a "more sympathetic" environment).

2. Our Missionary Institutions in Turkey are to be, likewise, subject to Turkish laws.

3. The Question of indemnity for damages suffered by Americans, "through arbitrary and illegal acts", has been left for later discussion.

4. Freedom of the Straits. Our merchant vessels may, as in the past, pass through the Dardanelles, which, however, may be closed at the will of the Turks, as was done in 1914, and on many other occasions.

5. Archaeological Research. Our archaeologists enjoy the same rights that are enjoyed by Turkish archaeologists. This only requires the comment that there have never been any Turkish archaeologists.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:40 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

6. Open Door. We resume our former privilege to trade with and invest in Turkey. The importance of that privilege may be gauged by the fact that, in 1913, American exports to Turkey amounted to $3,313,821, or 16c. per capita for the Turkish Empire. In that year, Turkey had an estimated population of 17,500,000—since reduced to 5,000,000.

7. Protection of Minorities. These are to "enjoy the protection" of Turkish laws—as in the past. Since 1774, Turkey has solemnly agreed, in 21 international documents, to protect the Christians.

What, then, it may be asked, did America accomplish at Lausanne?

Supported by the Turks, the American Delegation sought to secure, under the formula of the open-door, recognition for the so-called Chester Concession, parts of which were held by England and France to infringe upon the prior rights of their nationals, and succeeded *only* in leaving out of the Allied-Turkish Treaty any definitive provision concerning this matter.[1]

If, as appears, the Chester Concession was the inducement leading to the sacrifice of American rights and interests in Turkey, and to the abandonment of Armenia, then, in the light of our fuller knowledge of the illusory nature of this Concession—no longer even in American hands—the only plausible argument in favor of the Lausanne Treaty becomes untenable.

---

[1] The Ottoman-American Development Company, commonly known as the Chester group, is a Delaware corporation. Its original organizers were General George W. Goethals, Kermit Roosevelt, Frederick S. Blacknall, C. A. Barnard of Montreal, K. E. Clayton-Kennedy, S. T. Callaway, of Callaway, Fish & Co., W. G. Saunders, J. E. Kennedy, of the Kennedy Van Saun Engineering and Construction Company, and F. H. Potter, of Pouch & Co.

This concession has three chief features; 1. Mosul oil—is claimed by a British Company under a prior contract (1914); 2. Armenian oil—is claimed by Armenia, under the Sevrés Treaty; 3. Railways—part of which is claimed by a French Company, under a prior contract (1914), and for which this Company has made Turkey a loan of 420,000,000 Fcs.

The spokesmen for the Chester group placed the value of the Concession at $2,000,000,000. But, on August 29, 1923, the Chester Company (American-Ottoman Development Company) transferred its rights in the Concession to a Canadian Syndicate, for $300,000, plus 10 per cent. of any possible profits. In October, 1923, a Constantinople dispatch announced that the Angora Government had cancelled the Concession. In February, 1924, Serri Bey, Kemal's Commissar of Public Works, announced that "No further relations exist between the Turkish Government and Mr. Kennedy (representative of the successors of the Chester group)."—Ed.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:40 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

II.

In the light of the foregoing facts, it is scarcely to be seriously contended that the Lausanne Treaty is a good Treaty. It is, however, put forward that, in view of disturbed conditions existent in many parts of the world, even a bad Treaty is better than none. In order to ascertain the merit of this contention —if it have any merit at all—we must examine, briefly,

(*1-2*) *the record of the Kemalists* **before** *and* **since** *the signing of the Lausanne Treaty;*

(*3*) *the conditions which obtain in Turkey, and*

(*4*) *the question of whether a resumption of relations by America with Turkey would promote either peace or justice.*

1. According to reliable information, the Kemalists, during their four years of rule, have slaughtered over 1,300,000 Christians. Not only are they the grateful beneficiaries of the crimes of their predecessors, but they are now openly engaged in completing the extermination of the Christians. These facts scarcely show that the Kemalist Government is inclined to respect either the usages of international law, or observe even the terms of the treaty which it has just signed.

2. The Lausanne Treaty, like the Treaties of Vienna (1815); Paris (1856), and Berlin (1878), contains prima facie generous provisions in favor of the Christians. But history has demonstrated that any agreement which depends for its execution upon the good faith of the Turks alone is devoid of merit.

3. *Kemal's Government is in a precarious condition, and, according to cumulative information, its downfall is only a question of a short time.*

The mis-called Turkish "Republic" is more truly a military oligarchy. As IKDAM, a Turkish daily of Constantinople, aptly remarks: *"The same old people, with new titles, will govern in the same old way."*

* * * When it is suggested that the old pirate crew, with its new name of a "Republic," be given a fresh chance, we are reminded that our first duty is obviously to ourselves and to our faithful allies, who alone have been deprived of all the fruits of victory. At any rate, our recognition or non-recognition will neither help nor hinder the political "experiment" now said to

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:42 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

be in progress in Turkey. But, one thing is certain: *Kemal's Government must fall in the near future; and, equally certain is it that Kemal's successor will seek to retain all the rights and advantages which Kemal himself may have secured for Turkey.* Manifestly, the only honorable and wise course for America to pursue would be to stand on her rights, and await the demonstration of greater stability in Turkey than now exists or seems promised. Thus, Kemal's truculence will soon be moderated under the increasing pressure of stern realities, and his successor will know precisely the terms upon which America will resume relations with Turkey.

4. **The Lausanne Treaty promotes neither peace nor justice.** It recognizes and sanctions, in effect, the expulsion from their homes of the entire original populations, and confirms the enslavement of hundreds of thousands of Christian—Greek and Armenian—women and children. * * *

III.

Rejection by the Senate of the Lausanne Treaty would not prejudice what little interest America now has in Turkey; on the contrary, it would compel that country to prove as much by acts as by promises its worthiness to be included in the family of nations.

The Turks abrogated the capitulations in 1914, and, in consequence, our nationals and missionary institutions there became subject to Turkish laws. We cannot, obviously, improve their position by formally acquiescing in an arbitrary act. As for the remnants of the Armenians in Turkey—possibly 200,000—we have unhappily made it clear that we are unable to influence the Turkish Government in their behalf, any more now than in the past. * * *

* * *

Our paramount interests in Turkey are, and have ever been, humanitarian, and it is the manifest duty of our Government to safeguard these interests. We are confronted with a moral issue of supreme importance which cannot be compromised with honor. We believe that the American people, who have shown their great interest in Armenia, and who, for 92 years, have supported the philanthropic and educational efforts of the missionaries in behalf of the Christians of the Near East, expect their Government to subordinate other considerations to these primary interests.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:42 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

The case against the Lausanne Treaty may be summed up as follows:

It is morally an indefensible Treaty. It is an utterly humiliating and purposeless Treaty. It surrenders all and every American right in Turkey. It renders impossible the continuance of American educational and philanthropic enterprises in that country. It ignores our solemn pledges to Armenia. The economic concessions which it purports to secure for a few Americans are now admitted to be of dubious value, and have already been transferred into alien hands. The Turks have broken thus early their promises of good behavior and their guarantees to our missionaries and to the remnants of the Christians in Turkey. All reports which have recently reached the outside world from Turkish and foreign sources show that factional armed conflicts, widespread banditry, and hopeless economic chaos seriously threaten Kemal's regime, and that the task which confronts his Government is, according to the admission of its own leaders, a truly impossible one. America stands to gain absolutely nothing by resuming relations with a Turkey in this state, and can lose nothing further by maintaining the status quo and awaiting developments. The downfall of the Kemalists appears inevitable and imminent. By now surrendering our rights to Kemal, we shall find it difficult to reassert them against any regime which may overthrow and succeed him.

We believe that the honor of America, no less than every dictate of reason, demands that the Senate reject the Lausanne Treaty.

(*Signed*) LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT, *Editor, The Outlook.*
HENRY J. ALLEN, *Ex-Governor of Kansas.*
JAMES ROWLAND ANGELL, *President, Yale University.*
WALLACE W. ATWOOD, *President, Clark University.*
NEWTON D. BAKER, *Ex-Secretary of War.*
GEORGE GORDON BATTLE.
A. F. BEARD, *Editor, American Missionary.*
Rt. Rev. CHARLES H. BRENT, *Bishop of Western New York.*
Rt. Rev. FREDERICK BURGESS, *Bishop of Long Island.*
S. PARKES CADMAN, *D.D., Pastor, Central Congreg. Church, B'klyn.*

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:42 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

R. J. CALDWELL.
Bishop JAMES CANNON, *M. E. Church, Washington, D. C.*
EDWARD CAPPS, *Ex-Minister to Greece.*
MITCHELL CARROLL, *Editor, Art and Archaeology.*
CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT.
RUSSELL H. CONWELL, *President, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.*
CHANNING H. COX, *Governor of Massachusetts.*
Dr. FRANK CRANE, *Publicist.*
HOMER S. CUMMINGS, *Ex-Chairman, Democratic National Committee.*
JOSEPHUS DANIELS, *Ex-Secretary of Navy.*
Rt. Rev. JAMES H. DARLINGTON, *Bishop of Harrisburg.*
WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS, *Professor of History, University of Minnesota.*
GARRETT DROPPERS, *Ex-Minister to Greece.*
CHARLES W. ELIOT, *Pres.-Emeritus, Harvard University.*
ABRAM I. ELKUS, *Ex-Ambassador to Turkey.*
Rear Admiral BRADLEY A. FISKE, (*Retired*).
HALEY FISKE, *President, The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.*
Rt. Rev. JAMES E. FREEMAN, *Bishop of Washington.*
Rt. Rev. THOMAS F. GAILOR, *President, National Council, Episcopal Church.*
ROBERT H. GARDINER, *Gardiner, Me.*
LINDLEY M. GARRISON, *Ex-Secretary of War.*
JAMES W. GERARD, *Ex-Ambassador to Germany.*
HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, *Princeton U; Prof. of History and Political Economy, Robert College, 1909-12; Author, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, etc.*
RICHARD GOTTHEIL, *Prof. of Semitic Languages, Columbia Univ.*
MADISON GRANT, *Anthropologist.*
WILLIAM GRIFFITH, *Managing Editor, Current Opinion.*
WILLIAM GUGGENHEIM.
Dr. SIDNEY L. GULICK.
A. D. F. HAMLIN, *Prof. of Architecture, Columbia Univ.*
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, *Prof. of Government, Harvard Univ.*
J. LEWIS HARTSOCK, *D.D., Pastor, St. Andrews M. E. Church, N. Y.*
RAE D. HENKLE, *Editor, Christian Herald.*

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:46 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Capt. PAXTON HIBBEN, *Member, American Military Mission to the Near East, 1919.*
NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, *D.D., Pastor, Plymouth Congreg. Church, B'klyn.*
JOHN W. HOFFMAN, *Pres., Ohio Wesleyan University.*
EMORY W. HUNT, *President, Bucknell University.*
Col. JOHN PRICE JACKSON, *Member of American Military Mission to Turkey, 1919.*
HENRY W. JESSUP, *Secretary, American Committee for the Independence of Armenia.*
ROBERT UNDERWOOD JOHNSON, *Ex-Ambassador to Italy.*
HARRY PRATT JUDSON, *Pres. Emeritus, Univ. of Chicago.*
HENRY CHURCHILL KING, *President, Oberlin College.*
F. M. KIRBY, *Wilkes-Barre, Pa.*
PAUL S. LEINBACH, *D.D., Editor, The Reformed Church Messenger.*
FREDERICK LYNCH, *Editor, Christian Work.*
R. V. D. MAGOFFIN, *Pres. Archeaological Institute of America.*
J. H. T. MAIN, *Pres., Grinnell College; Comm'r of Near East Relief to Turkey and Armenia, 1919.*
CHARLES E. MANIERRE, *Lawyer.*
Rt. Rev. WILLIAM T. MANNING, *Bishop of New York.*
H. N. MACCRACKEN, *President, Vassar College.*
JOHN H. MACCRACKEN, *President, Lafayette College.*
Dr. CHARLES S. MACFARLAND.
VANCE C. MCCORMICK, *Ex-Chairman, Democratic National Committee.*
S. S. MCCLURE, *Publisher.*
SYDNEY E. MEZES, *President, College of the City of New York.*
FREDERICK COOK MOOREHOUSE, *Editor, The Living Church.*
HENRY MORGENTHAU, *Ex-Ambassador to Turkey.*
ROLAND S. MORRIS, *Ex-Ambassador to Japan.*
W. A. NEILSON, *President, Smith College.*
Rt. Rev. G. ASHTON OLDHAM, *Bishop Coadjutor of Albany.*
WILLIAM CHURCH OSBORN.
ALTON B. PARKER, *Democratic Presidential Candidate, 1904.*
JOHN M. PARKER, *Governor of Louisiana.*
GEORGE HENRY PAYNE, *Editor, The Forum.*

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:46 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

JOSIAH W. PENNIMAN, *President, University of Pennsylvania.*
FRED PERRY POWERS, *Editor, Philadelphia Record.*
GEORGE HAVEN PUTNAM, *Publisher.*
FLEMING H. REVELL, *Publisher.*
JAMES BRONSON REYNOLDS, *Pres., Amer. Inst. of Criminal Law and Criminology.*
Rt. Rev. PHILIP N. RHINELANDER, *Bishop of Pennsylvania.*
HENRY WADE ROGERS, *Judge, U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals.*
LEE M. RUSSELL, *Governor of Mississippi.*
CHARLES H. SABIN, *President, Guaranty Trust Co.*
WILLIAM J. SCHIEFFELIN, *Manufacturer.*
Rt. Rev. THOMAS J. SHAHAN, *Rector, The Catholic Univ. of America.*
KENNETH S. M. SILLS, *President, Bowdoin College.*
ALFRED E. SMITH, *Governor of New York.*
F. G. SMITH, *D.D., President, Missionary Board of the Church of God.*
WALTER GEORGE SMITH, *Ex-President, American Bar Association.*
CALEB R. STETSON, *D.D., Rector, Trinity Parish, New York.*
ERNEST M. STIRES, *D.D., Rector, St. Thomas's Church, New York.*
HENRY L. STODDARD, *Editor, New York Evening Mail.*
OSCAR S. STRAUS, *Ex-Ambassador to Turkey.*
WILLIAM SWEET, *Governor of Colorado.*
W. O. THOMPSON, *President, Ohio State University.*
CHARLES H. THWING, *President, Western Reserve University.*
FLOYD TOMPKINS, *D.D., Philadelphia.*
Dr. HENRY VAN DYKE.
E. N. VAN VALKENBURGH, *Editor, Philadelphia North American.*
JOHN R. VORIS, *Associate General Secretary, Near East Relief.*
Dr. RAY LYMAN WILBUR, *Pres., Stanford University.*
FULLERTON WALDO, *Associate Editor, Philadelphia Public Ledger.*
J. BERNARD WALKER, *Editor, Scientific American.*
BENJ. IDE WHEELER, *President-Emeritus, Univ. of California.*
EVERETT P. WHEELER, *Publicist.*
Rabbi STEPHEN S. WISE.
A. F. WOODS, *President. University of Maryland.*
GEORGE ZABRISKIE.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:47 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Abolition of the Caliphate

* * *

In 1517, Selim I, upon his conquest of Egypt, seized from the abbasid Caliph the relics of the Prophet—his sword, standard, mantle and hairs of his beard, and henceforth the Sultans of Turkey claimed the right to be recognized as the religious head of Islam. Indeed, for nearly two centuries, this religious pretension of the Sultans played a determining role in the retention of the Turkish State.

In 1923, the Kemalists divested the Sultan of his temporal power. But, under the Koranic law, the religious head of Islam must be possessed of both religious and temporal powers.

On March 3, 1924, the Kemalist Assembly abolished the Caliphate, and decreed the expulsion from Turkey of the "Caliph," and of the dynasty of Othman—first ruler of Turkey (b. 1258), of which the present "Caliph" is a member.

This action of Kemal has been prompted by two motives, i. e., Political and Financial:

1. Kemal is head of the so-called Popular Party—formed during the last two years—which is an offshoot of the Young Turk Party, also known as the Committee of Union and Progress. This latter Party is now working for the restoration of the Sultanate. By abolishing the Caliphate, Kemal is seeking to destroy the source of power of his opponents.

2. Nearly one-fourth of the lands of Turkey consists of Pious Foundations, the proceeds of which are used for religious purposes. The beneficiaries of this system—the clergy—are a powerful and fanatical caste, whose avowed sympathy is on the side of the Young Turk Party. By one stroke, Kemal is aiming at the control of this source of revenue and at the very vitals of his opponents.

Two natural results, however, will ensue from the action of Kemal.

1. It will strengthen the position of the Young Turk Party and intensify the opposition of the clergy against him. A reign of terror and civil strife will be the inevitable and imminent consequences of this condition.

2. It will deprive Kemal of the sympathy and support of Islam, and relegate Turkey to a status commensurate with her numerical, economic and cultural importance. It will reduce Turkey to the position of a third class, primitive, Asiatic State.

This epochal and suicidal action of Kemal, followed so soon upon the expulsion of the Christians, who were the mainstay of the economic life of Turkey, will accelerate the disintegration of the Turkish State.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:47 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Kemalist Turkey

* * *

The dramatic emergence of Mustafa Kemal into prominence within the last two years has caused a great volume of comment upon present day Turkey. Not a few of the commentators, of course, have private interests to serve. The Turkish Government is known to have sent 50,000 Turkish pounds (about $224,000) to America for propaganda purposes. The group of Chester concessionaires have been naturally interested to interpret Turkish affairs in a favorable manner, and a few of the missionaries, in view of the abandonment by the State Department of the protection of American humanitarian interests in Turkey, have been led to believe that the only policy remaining was to ingratiate themselves with the Turks. In consequence, those who were not acquainted with the case, have been led to believe, erroneously, that Turkey has become a greater power than ever before.

During the war Turkey put into the field about 1,200,000 men, but at the conclusion of the Armistice on October 1, 1918, that number had been reduced to about 50,000. It was authoritatively reported that there were about 100,000 desertions, so that Turkey must have lost over 1,000,000 men during the war.

The Sevres Treaty, concluded on August 10, 1920, allotted to the Turks (about 4,000,000), 232,000 square miles; to the Armenians (for the benefit of 3,000,000 Armenians of Turkey and Russia), about 40,000 square miles; to the Greeks, about 9,000 square miles, and freed Mesopotamia, Syria and Arabia. The Sevres Treaty was concluded nearly two years after the Armistice. This delay was due to the request which America had made to the Allies to defer action, and led to division among them, of which the Turks took advantage. France and Italy were antagonistic to the reunion and consolidation of the Greek race. Russia was opposed to the physical penetration of the Allies into the Near East, and also was eager to take advantage of any opportunity to create trouble for the "capitalistic" states. In consequence, France, Italy and Russia furnished Kemal with arms, munitions, supplies and money. Kemal secretly organized a force of about 150,000 men, and finally prevailed against the demoralized Greek army in Anatolia. The Greeks were successful for two years and more, but, eventually, owing to dissensions at home, the treachery of their Allies, and to the increasing feeling that whether successful

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:47 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

or not they would be compelled by those same Allies to withdraw from Asia Minor, they became dispirited and demoralized. They retired, without any serious conflict, over 185 miles within 15 days.

The Kemalists reached the shores of the Marmora with the avowed purpose of crossing over into Europe. They were faced by General Harrington with about 20,000 men under his command, and the "victorious" Turkish army dared not pass beyond the line defined by him.

At Lausanne the Turks, most unexpectedly, acquired an ally in the United States of America, or rather in the State Department, upon whose policy public opinion seems to have no effect. England and France were unwilling to yield to the Turks on the subject of the capitulations and on the Armenian case. But America made common cause with the Turks in order to gain their support in the policy of the open-door, and forced the Allies to yield.

Kemal owes his "military" success over Greece to France, Italy and Russia, and his "diplomatic" success at Lausanne to our own State Department.

Turkey—Area and Population

In 1914, Turkey had an area of 694,960 square miles. It had six geographical divisions, namely: 1.—Turkey in Europe, 12,000 square miles. 2.—Asia Minor or Anatolia, 193,000 square miles, of which 20,625 square miles belonged to Armenia Minor or Cilicia. 3.—Armenia, 101,000 square miles. 4.—Syria, including the Lebanon and Palestine, 50,285 square miles. 5.—Mesopotamia, 156,500 square miles. 6.—Arabia, 172,000 square miles.

Its population was variously estimated at from 17,500,000 to 21,000,000. But the former figure is, in the light of subsequent information, the more nearly correct. Basing our estimates thereupon, the various racial elements were divided as follows:

Arabs (Estimated)	6,000,000
Turks (Estimated)	6,000,000
Armenians (Church census)	2,103,000
Greeks (Estimated)	2,500,000
Kurds (Estimated)	1,250,000
Circassians (Estimated)	500,000
Other elements	500,000
	18,853,000[1]

[1] Turkey has never taken a census of her people. All figures are based upon Church census or consular reports. The Turkish Grand Vizier told the writer

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:47 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Present Day Turkey—
Area and Population

Area, about 300,000 square miles; population, about 5,000,000, of which 4,000,000 is Turkish.

A recent military estimate put the figure at 5,000,000, and,

---

in 1913 that the Turks numbered 6 to 8 millions. The Turks ordinarily include in their own number all the Moslems, except the Arabs. They have lost, since 1914, over 2,000,000 lives.

THE GREEKS of Turkey have been variously estimated between 2 and 3 millions. Up to March 1, 1923, Greece had received 1,150,000 refugees from Turkey, of whom nearly 115,000 were non-Greeks. There are now approximately 200,000 Greeks remaining in Turkey. If the pre-war Greek population of Turkey were only 2,500,000, then nearly 1,265,000 Greeks have perished since 1914.

THE KURDS have lost over 500,000 lives, and of the remaining, less than 200,000 are now within Turkish borders.

ARMENIANS: Estimated at 4,470,000 in the world, in 1914, since reduced to 3,004,000 (November, 1922).

1.—In Turkey:		
Constantinople	150,000	
Asia Minor	131,000	
		281,000
2.—In Russia:		
Republic of Erivan	1,200,000	
Georgia	400,000	
Azerbaidjan	340,000	
Region of Trans-Capian	30,000	
Other parts of Russia	225,000	
		2,195,000
3.—In Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia	104,000	
Egypt, Sudan and Abyssinia	28,000	
India, Java and Australia	12,000	
Persia	50,000	
		194,000
4.—In Greece and Cyprus	79,000	
Bulgaria	46,000	
Roumania	43,000	
Central and Western Europe	38,000	
		206,000
5.—In the United States and Canada	125,000	
South America	3,000	
		128,000
		3,004,000

Of the total indicated above, 817,873 are refugees from Turkey. The figures as to the refugees are based upon information furnished by the British Embassy, Constantinople, and by the agents of the Near East Relief Society, in 1921. The total given does not include the able-bodied Armenians, who are retained by the Kemalists, nor the women and children—approximately 95,000—according to the League of Nations—who have been forced to embrace Islam.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:47 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

on September 15, 1923, Mahomet, the deposed Sultan of Turkey, in a statement made at San Remo, Italy, said that there were 6,000,000 Moslems in Turkey, including Turks, Kurds, Circassians and others.

Turkey in Europe comprises an area of about 10,000 square miles, with a population of approximately 1,000,000, and Turkey in Asia has an area of about 290,000 square miles, and a population of about 4,000,000. Of the population of Turkey in Europe, about 300,000 is Christian,—Greek and Armenian,—about 75,000 Jewish, about 50,000 other non-Turkish elements, and the balance is Turkish. The population of Anatolia is now almost entirely Moslem, with the possible exception of about 75,000 native Christians, about 10,000 Italians, 15,000 Jews, and several hundred thousand Christian women and children held in slavery.

The bulk of the population of Anatolia is situated to the west of the Euphrates River. To the east of that river, in the Armenian provinces of Erzerum, Van and Bitlis, there are now not more than 85,000 Kurds, Turks and other minor elements. These three provinces had a pre-war population of over 1,362,000, of which the plurality was Armenian. Of the surviving Armenians, 286,000 are now refugees in the Trans-Caucasus.

Physical and Economic Conditions in Turkey

The Angora correspondent of the Moscow Isviestia writes that the whole of Western Anatolia looks like a desert. Likewise, the whole of Eastern Turkey,—the Armenian plateau,—east of the Euphrates, is but a vast heap of ruins, while practically the same can be said of large regions in Cilicia and along the Black Sea.

This Russian paper further states that epidemics are spreading throughout the country, and nearly 80% of Turkish children are afflicted with venereal diseases, consumption or malaria.

The Ministry of Public Works, which was charged with the task of rebuilding the country, resigned after reporting to the Assembly that it had counted nearly 300,000 dwellings and buildings that had been destroyed,—an enormous number for a country with such a sparse population.

The chief exports of Turkey before the war were rugs, figs and tobacco. As a result of the elimination of the Christians,

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:48 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

who were the chief producers and exporters of these products, the trade in them is practically dead.

Before the war, the Turks controlled only 12% of the commerce and now the trade of Turkey has declined almost to extinction.

Herbert N. Casson in an article dated London, published in the New York Evening Post, states that "As Turkey has recently expelled 2,000,000 Greeks and Armenians, who were the business people there, it is now probable that the country will fall behind and become sort of a peasant republic."

Before the war, the expenditures of the Turkish Government amounted to nearly $170,000,000 a year, and its present expenditures are estimated at $150,000,000, in spite of the great reduction in area and population which has taken place. Its deficits, before the war, varied between $35,000,000 and $60,000,000 per year, but are now variously estimated at between $50,000,000 and $130,000,000. This large divergence must be ascribed to the fact that the Government expects to derive revenues from sources which may not yield the amounts hoped for. Prior to 1914, when Turkey had a population of about 18,000,000, the revenue from alcohol was around $20,000,000 per year, whereas the Government now proposes to control its manufacture and sale and hopes to derive therefrom, $75,000,000 per year.

It is evident that not only is the Turkish Government bankrupt, but that it cannot hope to extract sufficient taxes from a population of impoverished peasants, of which nearly 85% are said by Ikdam, a Turkish daily of Constantinople, to be on the verge of starvation. The only hope of funds is through a foreign loan, which means a mortgage on the natural resources of the country. It is most evident that this primitive and unprogressive people could not support the railways and ambitious schemes of modern development with which certain irresponsible promoters and speculators have attempted to lure American investors. The only substantial sources of natural wealth are the Arghana copper mines, and the oil deposits in the Armenian provinces (about 220 miles long), a continuation of the Baku fields, but it is doubtful if any foreign syndicate will advance money on them because they are claimed by the Armenians, their legal owners, under the Sevres Treaty. Furthermore, under the Russo-Turkish agreement of March, 1921, as well, as in many previous international understandings, Russia has a prior right to any concession for the exploitation of the natural resources of the Eastern provinces of Turkey, where lie both the Arghana mines and the oil deposits.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:48 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Banditry and Civil Strife

The whole of Turkey is overrun by chetas or bands of robbers, frequently led by ex-army officers. A Turkish merchant who had safely traveled from Brusa to Constantinople, a distance of about 12 miles, in response to a question put to him by a Turkish newspaper as to how he had accomplished that feat, replied that he had traveled disguised as a bandit. The Turkish Premier announces that suppression of banditry must be a chief task of the Government. But, as in China, the problem seems to increase; in many instances troops that are sent against these bandits joining them instead of carrying out orders.

Kemal, Ismet and most of Kemal's adherents were, until the formation of the so-called Popular-Kemalist Party about two years ago, members of the Committee of Union and Progress, also known as the Young Turk Party. Recently, however, many of their leading members, including Reouf, Kemal's former premier, Rifat Pasha, military governor of Thrace, have returned to the Young Turk Party, which latter dominates the situation in Constantinople and is working zealously for the restoration of the Sultanate. A recent dispatch from the Constantinople correspondent of the London Daily Telegraph stated that an armed conflict between the Young Turks and the Kemalists was imminent and inevitable. In December, 1923, Ismet Pasha declared in the Assembly that "There is in Constantinople a secret organization whose purpose is to overthrow the republic."

There is much dissension among the 280 members of the Turkish Assembly who were elected as Kemalists. During December, turmoil and fisticuffs took place on the floor of the Assembly between the Kemalists and the adherents of the Young Turks.

Ismet sent a Military Court to Constantinople to try for treason the editors of three Young Turk newspapers for having published a letter of Agha-Khan, leader of Indian Moslems, addressed to Ismet, wherein he advised the strengthening of the position of the Caliph. The editors were acquitted, and, Djahid Bey, editor of Tanin, stated in the course of his trial that "the day is not far distant when I shall preside in this court over the trial of those who are now trying me." But, Lutfi, President of the Turkish Bar, who had addressed a letter to the Caliph, advising him not to renounce his prerogatives, has been condemned to five years' imprisonment. Likewise,

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:48 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Kadir Kemali, a deputy, has been arrested for having written an article in favor of the restoration of the Sultanate.

A cablegram dated Constantinople, January 1, 1924, states that the Kemalist Party is in a state of disintegration and that internecine strife is inevitable.

Three things are certain: Any Turkish state cannot exist without foreign economic help; the Powers will be inevitably driven by the logic of circumstance to resume their former policy of penetration and partition of Turkey, and to contrive some equivalent of the capitulatory rights, without which their nationals cannot safely do business in Turkey.

* * *

Random Notes About Turkey

The Council of Commissars has appropriated 10,000,000 pounds for the construction of the Angora-Sivas-Erzerum Railroad. (Note: There are, however, no funds in the Treasury.)

According to a cablegram, dated Angora, January 26, 1924, the Minister of Public Works states that the Government plans to build a public highway from Van to the Black Sea (about 500 miles) "to cost about 6,000,000 Turkish pounds."

According to Turkish newspapers of Constantinople, the employees of the Government there have received no salaries for several months past.

The Minister of Education recently issued a circular letter requiring all non-Turkish schools to employ Turkish teachers for the teaching of Turkish, said teachers to be designated by the Ministry, and to receive a salary of from forty to sixty pounds a month, all schools not complying to be closed.

The Ministry of the Interior has ordered 220 foreign business houses closed on the ground of failure to be registered.

In August, 1923, after the signing of the Lausanne Treaty, over 100 Armenians and Greeks were executed at Ismid by order of General Nurreddine Pasha, commander of the Turkish army. Djemal Bey, former Minister of the Interior, has been summoned to Angora to explain his statement, quoted by the editor of Le Moniteur Oriental, a French publication, that the former Turkish Government had slaughtered 800,000 Armenians and deported 400,000 Greeks.

Djevdet Bey, editor of Ikdam, states that Christians and Turks can no longer live in the same territories.

The Angora Government has ordered the deportation of 150,000 Circassians.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:48 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

The Turkish police have ordered the expulsion of all Roumanian students in Robert College.

According to a cablegram from Constantinople, three American sailors have been recently arrested in that city by the Turkish police for wearing their uniforms after 5 p. m.

On November 7, 1923, Haidar Bey, the Governor of Angora, ordered the local foreign business houses to give positions to fifty retired army officers.

According to an order issued by the Director of the Press in Constantinople, all news agencies must hereafter secure their service through the official Turkish Press Bureau.

Turkish papers have begun an agitation against the Jews.

By order of the Government all inscriptions and numbers on commercial and educational institutions must hereafter be in Turkish characters, for which there is a fixed tax, but if beneath the Turkish characters other inscriptions in foreign characters are used, the tax shall be increased sevenfold.

According to a dispatch to the Daily Express, dated October 6, 1923, the Government has ordered the closing of all foreign hospitals and Red Cross establishments in Constantinople, and has forbidden foreign doctors and dentists to practise.

Four Greek papers of Constantinople have been ordered closed on the ground that their publishers have fled from Constantinople.

By order of the Turkish Government, the Greek and Armenian Archbishops of Constantinople, who have been heretofore known as Patriarchs, must abandon that title, and be known hereafter as Chief Priests.

According to a dispatch to the New York Times, dated August 20, 1923, "All the Greeks and Armenians remaining in the interior are being rounded up for deportation, and 20,000 Armenians have reached, in a pitiable condition, the border of Erivan, Russian Armenia."

All the property of those that have been expelled or are being expelled has been seized by the Government.

The Government has, by decree, made it obligatory upon all foreign and native non-Turkish business houses to use the Turkish language in all transactions.

The Province of Van, Armenia, had a pre-war population of 350,000. According to a traveler who arrived in the Trans-Caucasus on September 13, 1923, there is now in the city of Van and in the adjacent regions, about 20,000 Kurds and Turks. This traveler further states that at the conclusion of the Armistice, there were over 4,000 Armenians in the city of Van, who have been deported by the Government to Diarbekir, thence back to Van, again back to Diarbekir,

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:49 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

and thence again back to Van; thereby their number being reduced to 600.

A Constantinople dispatch (February, 1924) states that the negotiations between the Turkish Government and the Ottoman Bank (a French-British institution with a capital of $50,000,000) are deadlocked. The Turkish government claims the right to appoint the officers of the bank, and, further, demands a loan of £10,000,000, without interest, the alternative being forfeiture by the bank of its charter.

The Lausanne Treaty (Page 141, Chapter 1, Article 1, Conditions of Residence and Business) provides for "Complete reciprocity to nationals and corporations of the contracting parties in the territories of the said Powers."

Under Article 38 of the Lausanne Treaty, "The Turkish Government undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Turkey, without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion."

Vakit, a daily of Smyrna, states that before the war there were 311 factories in Smyrna and now there are only two,—of which one is German.

Before the war, the Turks decreased at the rate of 2¼% per year. Polygamy, unnatural practices, the hard labor which women perform, miscegenation and the prevalence of venereal diseases are among the chief causes of the low birth rate. Also, the death rate among children,—in fact, at all ages—is very high.

Auguste Gauvain, editor of Le Journal des Debats, states in the November 1, 1923, issue of that paper that, "Inevitably Turkey will be colonized by foreigners owing to their (the Turks) lack of the personnel indispensable for industry, commerce and even for agriculture," and cites the case of the municipality of Constantinople which has just purchased paving stones, paying for freight alone twice as much as they would have cost had they been procured in the quarries just a few hours beyond the Bosphorus, which were formerly operated by Christians.

The Constantinople correspondent of the London Times telegraphs, under date of December, 1923, that the Young Turks are conducting an effective propaganda against Kemal and in favor of the restoration of the Sultanate.

Constantinople has become a strong center of all the anti-Kemalists.

A cablegram from Berlin reports that the "rumblings reaching Central Europe indicate that discontent with Mustafa Kemal's handling of affairs is increasing."

Shukri Bey, an ex-deputy, and Abdul Kadir, ex-governor of Angora, fled from Constantinople on December 27, 1923, being accused of anti-Kemalist activities.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:49 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

According to correspondence from Constantinople, dated December, 1923, seventy or more members of the Young Turk Party have been arrested, charged with plotting against the Government.

Ileri, a Kemalist journal of Constantinople, states that the most sinister portent in Turkey is the prevailing internal dissension, and, furthermore it states that Europe has lost confidence in the stability of the Kemalist Government.

In December, 1923, Reouf Bey, former Premier of Kemal, was summoned from Constantinople to answer to the Assembly on the charge that he was plotting against the republic. In the course of his explanations, he stated that the proclamation of the republic was effected by a few of the personal friends of Kemal and was contrary to a prior understanding which they had arrived at.

Two Kemalist financial missions, which went to Paris and London to attempt to negotiate a loan, have been unsuccessful, and state that European financial interests have no faith in the stability of the existing regime.

Ahmed Rustem Bey, former Turkish Ambassador to Washington, writes that "Government officials admit that the task of setting Turkey on her feet is an almost super-human one."

"The same old people with a new name will govern in the same old way," comments Tevhid,—a Turkish daily of Constantinople,—upon the new regime.

Dr. A. R. Hoover, head of the American Hospital in Constantinople, has left for America, declaring that he does not care to continue work under the new Turkish regime.

Alfred T. Burri, U. S. Consul at Constantinople, upon his arrival in New York recently, stated, according to the *New York Times,* that "the Turks know that they cannot do business without the Greeks and Armenians * * * and bribery has already been revived in Constantinople."

The Turkish Assembly has voted a salary of $81,000 to Mustafa Kemal.

The price of flour in Constantinople has increased twelve-fold.

Ikdam, a Turkish daily of Constantinople, states that every day bloody encounters take place in Smyrna between the 24,000 Moslem refugees from Macedonia and the Turks of Smyrna in disputes over the abandoned property of the Greeks and Armenians. Turkish papers of Constantinople, commenting upon these occurrences, look with grave apprehension upon the economic and political consequences of the exchange of populations, which the Turkish delegation at Lausanne proposed and insisted upon, and, as a result of which, nearly 400,000 Moslems are being unwillingly unrooted from their homes in Thrace and compelled to migrate to Turkey.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:50 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Foreign business houses decline to accept registered mail, except in the presence of Turkish officials, on the ground that such mail containing valuables is being habitually pilfered. Ileri, the Kemalist journal, seeks to palliate the insecurity of the mails by a tu quoque, and attributes its especial occurrence in Turkey to the unenviable economic conditions that obtain.

According to Ileri, a Kemalist journal of Constantinople, two Armenian physicians have been arrested, charged with having shown a friendly disposition toward the Allies during their occupation of Constantinople, and the police have in their possession an extensive list of Armenians and Greeks who have committed similar offenses. According to information from other sources, the jails of Constantinople are already overflowing with those arrested upon this charge.

The Lausanne Treaty (Page 191) provides that

> "No person who inhabits, or who has inhabited Turkey, and reciprocally, or who inhabits Greece, or who has inhabited Greece, shall be disturbed or molested in Turkey, and reciprocally in Greece, under any pretext whatsoever, on account of any military or political action taken by him, or any assistance of any kind given by him to a foreign power signatory of the Treaty of Peace, or to the nationals of such power, between the 1st of August, 1914, and the 20th of November, 1922"; and, further, that "Full and complete amnesty shall be granted by the Turkish Government and by the Greek Government for all crimes or offenses committed during that same period, which were evidently connected with the political events which have taken place during that period."

According to information from Constantinople, concerning the attempt to assassinate Kemal at Smyrna, a Turk sought to deliver to him a bulky package. But Kemal's wife received it instead and was seriously injured.

According to a cablegram, under date of December 3, 1923, a Military Council has been held in Tiflis, Trans-Caucasus, under the presidency of General Budenny, to adopt military measures to meet a threatened rebellion by Georgia and Azerbaidjan. Turkey has 24,000 troops at Kars, and it is charged that she is attempting to instigate an uprising in the Trans-Caucasus.

"*London, January* 29, 1924.—Prohibition in Turkey came to an ignominious end Sunday, says a Constantinople dispatch to the Daily Mail, when Premier Ismet Pasha's proposal to restore liquor as a state monopoly received the unanimous approval of the national assembly."

A cablegram from Constantinople, dated January 5, 1924, pictures in somber colors the condition of Moslems who are being transported from Thrace into Turkey. It states that 20,000 Moslems, in the district of Salonika, left their homes and have been waiting for embarkation for several weeks. 20 to 25 persons are dying every day from

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:50 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

exposure and privation. Turkish papers of Constantinople are urging the Government to secure 200 or 300 ships for the transportation into Turkey of all the Moslems of Greece, whose number is placed at 450,000.

Soubhi, Kemal's Commissar of Finance, has stated that there was very little hope of securing any loan either in Europe or in the United States, but that a substantial loan might be secured in South America, provided Turkey was willing to pay from 18 to 20% interest.

A telegram to the London Daily Dispatch, dated January 2, 1924, from San Remo, Italy, quotes Mahomet, the deposed Sultan of Turkey, as follows:

"I am the only Caliph. The decree of Angora is a scrap of paper. The rebels of Angora have violated the rights of Islam. 6,000,000 Moslems of Turkey have no right to interfere with the prerogatives of the Caliph. I am the Caliph. The man who now styles himself 'Caliph' and who is under the control of Angora, has neither secular nor religious authority. My flight from Constantinople is similar to that of the Prophet from Mecca."

According to a report, published in Rome (February, 1924), on the authority of a prominent Italian, who has just returned from Smyrna, the movement for an uprising against the Kemalist regime is gathering increasing force and recruits, owing to intolerable living conditions and the widespread state of lawlessness. The Moslem refugees from Greece are joining the ranks of the malcontents and are refusing to settle in the hinterland, on account of lack of safety. Even in Smyrna, it is impossible to venture out into the street after dusk. Foreign Consuls cannot protect their own nationals.

Paris, February 27.—A collective note has been handed to the Turkish authorities in Constantinople for transmission to Angora, protesting the vexatious measures recently taken against the foreign schools in Turkey and declared to be contrary to the treaty of Lausanne. Several French schools have been closed in consequence of the measures.

Serri Bey, Kemal's Commissar of Public Works, has made the following announcement (February, 1924): "No further relations exist between the Turkish Government and Mr. Kennedy (representative of the Chester group). Mr. Kennedy has said that he has already procured a few millions, (whether rubles or marks is not stated) and that he can get more, if the Government should agree to renew the Concession. The Government is looking into the matter, not with a view of renewing the Concession, but to offer, perhaps, fresh proposals.

Serri Bey has also announced that the Government will build the Samsun-Sivas line, and is now considering the proposition of buying over the railroads in Turkey from their foreign owners—if and when the Government should come into the possession of funds to do these things.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:50 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Constantinople, Feb. 20, 1924.—The police authorities of Constantinople have issued an order directing all Christian Institutions to observe the Moslem sabbath, which falls on Friday. The Ministry of Public Instruction has rescinded an order exempting American Institutions from operation of the decree, and Robert College and the American Woman's College will suspend classes beginning February 22. (This means that Christian schools must observe Moslem and Christian Holidays, but Moslem schools will only observe Moslem Holidays—an example of the equality and freedom which the Lausanne Treaty promises).

William Jordan Rapp, who returned recently from Turkey, where he served in an official capacity, in an article, in the March number of The Current History Magazine, after setting forth the farcical character of the "republican" movement and the causes of the intense state of unrest in Turkey, makes the following illuminating comment upon the "westernization" of the Turk:

> ". . . . I have read the editorial comments in the English and French press on the republic of Turkey. There was much said of the Westernization of the Near East. . . .
>
> "Much of this was wide of the mark and based upon ignorance of the actual situation. . . . The Near East will never be Westernized until there exists an enlightened opinon which can make itself heard with rapidity and directness on all public questions. In Turkey this means years of education for the mass of the people, *who are now almost totally illiterate.* It means the existence of an enlightened, progressive, democratic Government, and this, from the best information I have been able to gather, not from foreign but from Turkish sources, the Turks do not possess."

These facts show clearly that we cannot bolster up by any means or by any makeshift treaty a territorial expression which has so many inherent weaknesses, nor can we promote the cause of world peace by acceptance of a status quo which contains so many elements of future disturbance.

The Kemalist experiment is the last spasm of a dying nation. The Turk's power, builded upon murder, rape and rapine, is fast disappearing under the pressure of irresistible moral and physical laws. In 1845, he ruled over 45,000,000—now shrunk to 5,000,000. By slaughtering or expelling the Christians, the Turks struck at the very life of the Turkish state. "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

V. C.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:50 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

JUDGE HUGHES ON ARMENIA

" . . . We have always been the friends of the Armenians, admiring their industry, their intellectual alertness, their keenness, their sobriety, their aptitude for education and affairs; and we have revolted at the thought of such a people being under the yoke of the Turk.

"Now, we rejoice that the hour of liberation has come. The vain ambition of brute force has overreached itself and has resulted in the emancipation of the downtrodden and oppressed of centuries. There is to be a settlement of this long account and the credit balance is to be found in the opportunity for a free and independent life.

"There is no doubt of the capacity of the Armenians for freedom. They are as capable of self-government as any people. They have shown a racial solidarity and a capacity to survive incredible misfortunes; they have rare intelligence, and no people prize more highly the advantages of education. Even in the midst of suffering, they have proved their capacity. Despite their persecution, their ability has made them essential even to Turkish administration and they have furnished the brains of the Ottoman Empire. All they need is a fair opportunity, that decent opportunity which only civil and religious liberty can provide.

"We propose to-night to throw such influence as we have into the scale for Armenian independence. . . ."
—*From a speech by Mr. Justice* HUGHES, *delivered at a Banquet, at Hotel Plaza, New York, held under the auspices of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, on February 8, 1919.*

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:51 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

PLEDGES AND COMMITMENTS BY THE ALLIED GOVERNMENTS TO ARMENIA, AND DECLARATIONS BY ALLIED LEADERS IN SUPPORT OF THE CASE OF ARMENIA.

Mr. Lloyd George, on January 5, 1918, solemnly declared in the House of Commons that the recognition of the separate condition of Armenia shall constitute one of the war aims of Great Britain. In September, 1918, at Manchester, Mr. Lloyd George said that the British Government recognizes its responsibility to Armenia.

* * *

Mr. **Balfour,** replying to an interpellation by Mr. Ramsay **MacDonald,** in the House of Commons, on July 11th, 1918, said:

> "His Majesty's Government is following with earnest sympathy and admiration the gallant resistance of the Armenians [in the Caucasus] in defence of their liberties and honor. I would refer the Honorable Member to the public statements made by leading statesmen among the Allied Powers in favor of a settlement [of the Armenian Case] upon the principle of self-determination."

* * *

M. **Clemenceau,** by a letter dated July, 1918, and addressed to the Armenian National Delegation, Paris, said:

> "France, the victim of the most unjust of aggressions, has included in her peace terms the liberation of oppressed nations.
>
> "The spirit of self-abnegation of the Armenians, their loyalty towards the Allies, their contributions to the Foreign Legion, to the Caucasian front, and to the Oriental Legion have strengthened the ties that connect them with France.
>
> "I am happy to confirm to you that the government of the Republic, like that of Great Britain, has not ceased to place the Armenian nation among the peoples whose fate the Allies intend to settle according to the supreme laws of Humanity and Justice."

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:53 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Baron **Sonino,** Italian Foreign Minister, on February 8, 1919, cabled Mr. **Gerard,** Chairman, The American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, that,

> "I am very happy of the occasion offered me to express once more the sentiments of heartfelt sympathy with which the Royal Government follows the constant and noble efforts of Armenia for her independence and unity."

* * *

M. **Raymond Poincare,** President of France, by a letter dated February 16, 1919, and addressed to Monseigneur **Paul Pierre,** Armenian Archbishop of Cilicia, said:

> ". . . As France never doubted Armenia, so Armenia never doubted France; and, after having borne together common tribulations and sufferings for the triumph of Right and Justice in the world, the two friendly countries may now commune with each other with a common joy and common pride. The government of the Republic does not consider that it has already accomplished the task that devolves upon it with regard to the Armenian people. It knows full well that Armenia, and particularly noble Cilicia, expect it to help them so that it may be possible for them to enjoy in security the benefits of peace and liberty. I may assure your Beatitude that France shall respond to the faith that has been reposed in her."

* * *

M. **Briand,** in the Chamber of Deputies, in July, 1921, said:

> ". . . During the war, France decided to occupy Syria and Cicilia, as the only means of securing the protection of the Christians, particularly of the Armenians. For that reason, many Armenian-Americans responded to the call of our representatives in America, and many of them came to Europe at their own expense, to join our 'Oriental Legion.' When, about a month and a half ago, we informed the British Government of our intention to withdraw from Cilicia, that Government objected. We understand that those Armenian-Americans, who fought in the Oriental Legion, have addressed themselves to the American Government, and asked that Government to remind France of the necessity of fulfilling the promises made by France to the Armenians of Cicilia. France shall fulfill her international duties not only to satisfy her Allies, but also her Associate—the United States. . . ."

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:53 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

ARMENIA'S CASE IN THE FRENCH CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES

From the French Le Journal Officiel, parts of a speech delivered by M. **Bellet,** in the Chamber of Deputies, on December 24, 1920.

". . . I lived in the East twenty-five years, and I may say that I know the Easterners better than the majority of the members of this Chamber.

". . . In 116, M. **Briand,** who was then President of the Council of Ministers, decided to organize a legion to fight in the East, which was known as the Legion of the Orient. The formation of this unit was started in Paris.

"Syrians and Armenians were invited to join this Legion, who responded in large numbers. This Legion, which was first known as the Legion of the Orient, was subsequently called 'The Armenian Legion.'

"It was formed of Armenian emigres, who had migrated from Turkey to Egypt, America, and other parts of the world. They came to form this Armenian Legion—from 5,000 to 6,000 volunteers.

"In order to avoid the possibility of provoking massacres in Turkey, the task of getting together these men was conducted quietly; the men were selected one by one and assembled at Cyprus. It was there that the Armenian Legion was brought into being.

"This Legion was informed upon the following conditions:

1. That the formation of the Legion of the Orient had for its principal objects to enable the Armenians to contribute toward the liberation of Cilicia, and to furnish additional rights upon which to base the realization of their national aspirations.

2. That said Legion was to fight the Turks, and in Cilicia only, and

3. That the Armenian Legion would constitute in the future the nucleus of the Armenian army in Cilicia.

"These are the facts of the case. These negotiations were conducted at London by a French Representative, who was then negotiating with the British government the accord since known as the Sykes-Picot Compact—an achievement which has particularly won for M. Briand our gratitude.

"The second of the conditions I have named (that the Armenian Legion was to fight in Cilicia only) was later found to be impracticable; and, after some negotiations, the Armenians recognized that by fighting in Syria they would best attain the liberation of Cilicia, and that such a course of action was well within the terms of their agreement with us.

"That is why the Armenian Legion fought in Syria, and fought brilliantly. It constituted more than one-half of the French troops under Col. de Piepape.

"I have already presented a true picture of the situation. But, I must add to what I have already said that when M. Georges Picot was nominated High Commissioner to Syria, by a government which is no longer in power, his official title was 'High Commissioner to Syria and Armenia'; and, when our troops entered Cilicia, accompanied by French Administrators, these Administrators bore the title of 'French Administrators in Armenia.'"

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:53 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

A RUSSIAN VIEW ABOUT ARMENIA

On Monday, July 4, 1921, at a meeting held under the auspices of the Social and Political Educational Committee, in the Palace of Justice, Paris, M. **Maklakoff,** Ambassador of the Provisional Russian Government to France, said:

"The principle of self-determination does not mean absolute independence. Subject races may be liberated through gradual processes. But, when the Trans-Caucasian nationalities declare themselves independent, and unite themselves against their former mother country, then I consider them as being hostile to Russia. There are in the Trans-Caucasus sea-coasts and cities, which Russia cannot abandon without endangering her own defense and economic interests.

"But, our view concerning Armenia is altogether different. Her case has no similarity to that of the other Trans-Caucasian countries; because the Armenian case sprung from beyond the frontiers of Russia. The case of Armenia has been and is her liberation from the yoke of Turkey. We have always been sympathetic with her cause and have made sacrifices to bring about its successful culmination. During our war with Turkey to liberate Bulgaria, we occupied parts of the Armenian provinces. Today, those provinces have not been wholly liberated, and, indeed, they have been converted into a heap of ruins. Russian Armenia is small in area; Turkish Armenia is extensive. There is today in Russian Armenia an Armenian people, a considerable number of which are refugees from Turkish Armenia.

"We know that if Russian Armenia is not united with Turkish Armenia, Armenia remains but a veritable desert. We gladly and willingly leave Russian Armenia to Greater Armenia, so that the people of Russian Armenia may participate in the reconstruction and growth of Greater Armenia.

"The case of Armenia may be rightly compared with that of Poland. Part of Poland lay without Russia, and, we willingly ceded Warsaw to Poland to complete her unification."

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:53 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

ARMENIA AND THE ALLIES

In the agreement of armistice, signed on October 30, 1918, between the Allies and Turkey, the Allies reserved to themselves the right to occupy any or all of the "SIX ARMENIAN VILAYETS," in the event of any disorders taking place in them, which Vilayets comprise an area of 96,000 square miles. But, by the Treaty of Sevres, the Allies allotted to Armenia only parts of FOUR VILAYETS, which comprise an area of about 40,000 square miles.

* * *

In January and April, 1920, the Allies and the United States recognized the Armenian Republic as an independent State.

* * *

Part III. of the Treaty of Sevres (August 10, 1920), relating to Armenia, reads as follows:

Turkey recognizes Armenia as a free and independent State, and agrees to accept the arbitration of the President of the United States of America upon the question of the frontier between Turkey and Armenia in the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van and Bitlis, and upon Armenia's access to the sea.

* * *

On March 12, 1921, Mr. Lloyd George on behalf of the Allied Premiers, in session in London, delivered to the Turkish Delegates from Constantinople and Angora, thirteen proposals, as a basis of the revision of the Sevres Treaty, of which proposal No. 11 refers to Armenia, and reads as follows:

"Turkey to recognize the rights of Turkish Armenians to a national Home on the eastern frontiers of Turkey in Asia, delimitation of the frontiers to be decided by a commission appointed by the Council of the League of Nations."

* * *

On March 27, 1922, the Allied Foreign Ministers, in session in Paris, agreed upon the complete revision of the Sevres Treaty in favor of the Turks, of which they published a paraphrase in the form of a memorandum. The proposal referring to Armenia reads as follows:

"The situation of the Armenians has received special consideration, as much on account of the obligation contracted by the Allied Powers during the war as on account of the cruel suffering endured by that people. Consequently the aid of the League of Nations is sought, in addition to the provisions made for the protection of minorities, with a view to satisfying the traditional aspirations of the Armenian people and the establishment of a national home for them."

* * *

The Lausanne Treaty (August 6, 1923) makes no mention of Armenia nor the Armenians.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:54 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 109656550

Issued by the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia
One Madison Avenue
New York City

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-12-29 21:54 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112109656550 / Public Domain, Google-digitized

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN